Library of Princeton Theological Seminary
MAY 7 1888
Division BS2715
Section .D247
V. 2

AN

EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL

TO THE

COLOSSIANS,

BY

THE RIGHT REV. JOHN DAVENANT, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY;

PRESIDENT OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, AND LADY MARGARET'S PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN CAMBRIDGE:

ORIGINALLY DELIVERED, IN A SERIES OF LECTURES, BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN;

WITH A LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

AND NOTES

ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE WRITERS AND AUTHORITIES REFERRED TO IN THE WORK:

BY JOSIAH ALLPORT,

MINISTER OF ST. JAMES'S, BIRMINGHAM.

TO THE WHOLE IS ADDED, A TRANSLATION OF

DISSERTATIO DE MORTE CHRISTI

BY THE SAME PRELATE.

Quæ Pauli Epistola non melle dulcior, lacte candidior?—Ambr. Serm. 63.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

BIRMINGHAM:

BEILBY, KNOTT, AND BEILBY.

MDCCCXXXII.

BIRMINGHAM:
THOMAS KNOTT, PRINTER.

EXPOSITION

OF

THE THIRD CHAPTER.

WE have now finished the two former Chapters of this Epistle; and shall proceed, with the Divine assistance, to the explication of the third Chapter. But, in the first place, we must premise, what the scope of the Apostle is; for it is useful, nay, necessary to have this before our eyes, that we may understand what an apt and suitable bearing all his observations have upon it. The whole discussion, then, of the Apostle has respect to this, viz. that after the doctrine of the faith of the Gospel had been established, and the impostures of false apostles exploded, he might stir up the Colossians to exercise holiness of life, and avoid corrupt morals. For it is customary with St. Paul, in all his Epistles, to subjoin to disputations concerning the faith, exhortations to newness of life: For he would have a good tree to bear good fruit, namely, a sound faith to yield a holy life. You perceive the scope. In the second place, then, it is easy to elicit the sum or argument of the whole Chapter, and, as it were, to include it in a few lines. This, then, is what is here inculcated by the Apostle, viz. that the Colossians, and so all true Christians, are made partakers of the death and resurrection of Christ; and on this account it behoves them to die to sin, to live to God, to put off the old man with his deeds, and to put on the new man. The sum, then, of the Apostolic exhortation is contained in these two propositions: 1, A

new and heavenly life must be entered upon by those who are risen again with Christ. 2, The indwelling corruption of our nature must be mortified by those who are dead with Christ.

It remains that we proceed to the parts of this Chapter. And here we have a two-fold exhortation: A *General* one which regards all Christians alike, from the beginning of the Chapter to verse 18. A *special*, or personal one, which is directed to certain orders of Christians, namely, to wives and husbands, children and parents, servants and masters; from the 18th verse to the end of the Chapter. The *general* exhortation is distributed into three branches.

The first, comprehended in the four first verses, teaches us how, and stirs us up to seek the true end, that is to say, heaven, and Christ dwelling in heaven.

The second exhorts to the practice of those things which are ordained to this end. And this practice consists in mortification, i. e. the laying aside of vices; and vivification, i. e. the exercise of all virtues: concerning which he discourses largely from the 5th to the 16th verse.

The third calls to the meditation and study of the Divine Word, and likewise prescribes a general rule to be observed in all our actions, vers. 16 and 17.

I conceived these things should be premised, because we are led more easily by parts to the knowledge of the whole. I shall not follow out more of this sort, because (as Seneca has well observed) *there is in too many divisions as great a fault as in no division.* It is useful to distribute a subject matter into parts; it is frivolous to mince it: for to take in the minutest points with the same care as one would the greatest, is mere toil. Therefore, we shall observe the parts and smaller matters of the divisions as they offer themselves in the explanation of the context, which, relying upon the Divine aid and the illumination of the Holy Spirit, we forthwith enter upon.

CHAP. III. Verses 1, 2.

If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.
Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

Having established the doctrine of the Gospel, and vanquished the seducers, the Apostle comes to the business of exhortation, that he might train to holiness of life those whom he had brought to hold the truth of faith. But this exhortation arises and is deduced from the twelfth and thirteenth verses of the preceding Chapter, where these words occur, *Buried with him in baptism, who hath also raised and quickened you:* hence he now infers, *If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above.* We have said that the first branch of the general exhortation is included in the four first verses; and has for its object to excite the Colossians to aim at and desire the true good, viz. what is spiritual and divine; and, moreover, to beget in them a contempt of apparent good things, viz. corporeal and earthly ones. And the Apostle acts prudently in prescribing and defining, in the first place, the thirst for the true end: since inordinateness of the will as to the end, engenders inordinate and monstrous actions through the whole course of our life; for as the form is the principal in natural things, so the end is in morals.

But to come to the matter itself, here are two things to be observed by us.

1. The duty to which we are excited by the Apostle, comprehended in three precepts: Seek those things which are above; φρονεῖτε, i. e. *think upon and love the things above; seek not after, neither mind, earthly things.*

2. The inducements, or motives (as they say) to the performance of this duty. For the seeking and loving the things above, two inducements are brought: one taken from our resurrection; vers. 1, *Ye are risen with Christ:* the

other from the exaltation of Christ; *where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God.* For the despising earthly things two others are used; the first derived from our spiritual death; *Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ,* vers. 4; the latter, from the expectation of our life of glory; *When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*

1. Of the duties.

Seek those things which are above.] The word *Seek* indicates labour and effort; and, to use the scholastic phrase, excludes *sluggish willingness.* By the *things which are above* we must understand, in the first place, the kingdom of heaven, or the beatific vision of God, and those pleasures to be hereafter enjoyed with Christ our Head and the blessed angels, which *neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man,* 1 Cor. ii. 9. But, secondly and consequently, we must understand those gifts of grace which are the seeds of this desired glory, as faith, love, holiness, and all those means by which, as by an intermediate path, God would have us proceed to this mark of heavenly glory. For Augustine hath properly remarked, that these things may also be called *things which are above,* because *as to the excellency of their worth they far surpass earthly things;* as, furthermore, because all things of this kind *are bestowed from above, and come down from the Father of lights,* Jas. i. 17. When, therefore, the Apostle exhorts to *seek those things which are above,* he would have us to understand, that we ought not only to seek celestial pleasures, but so to live that we may at length attain to them. For he who does not advance in faith, love, and holiness, he does not, by the whole course of his life, seek heaven, but hastens to hell.

Hence we infer,

1. That heaven is not given to the indolent, but to those who seek it by great labour, *Seek ye the kingdom of God, and his righteousness,* Matt. vi. 33. And elsewhere, *the violent take it,* not those who slumber.

2. Celestial pleasures are not possessed in this life: we should, therefore, long after and patiently expect those

things, being certain to obtain them at last, if we seek them as we ought to do.

Τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, *Mind the things above, think upon* or *savour them.*] The word φρονεῖτε, in our translation *set your affections*, embraces two acts; the act of the mind or of the understanding reflecting about any thing; and the act of the will and affections approving and loving any thing: Therefore, the Apostle would have us raise our minds to heaven, and perpetually have those things above at heart; neither that alone, but that we should ardently love those things, and fix our affection upon them. Unless we join these two, no one will prepare to seek heavenly things; for *there is no desire of a thing unknown:* it is, therefore, necessary to know, and frequently to revolve in mind, these heavenly things; for no one seeks that about which he thinks not: But neither is it sufficient to think, unless it is done with love and affection; for nothing is sought by us except that which is desired and loved. Bernard truly observed, *The understanding and the affection in men are sometimes opposed to each other, so that the one knows and approves the things which are above, although the other is found to desire the things on the earth.* When that happens, the mind is distracted and torn away, not excited to seek. Hence it is that Paul exhorts us not only to know, but to savour the things which are above.

Hence we learn:

1. That it is the duty of a pious and Christian man, always to have in mind that heavenly kingdom, and those heavenly good things which relate to the attainment of it. We observe this in Abraham, the father of the faithful, of whom the Apostle testifies, Heb. xi. 10, that *he looked for a city which hath foundations.* This we read of the Christians of the primitive Church, who had this kingdom above so frequently in their minds and discourse, that from thence they fell under the suspicion, among the heathen, of aiming at the sovereignty. Just. Martyr. Apol. 2. ad Antoninum.

2. It is also their duty who hope they shall obtain eternal blessedness, to order the course of their life according to heavenly considerations; and to judge of all matters

with a constant reference to these supernal things: for this is effectually *to savour the things above,* viz. to be so affected by their excellence and sweetness, as to thirst for them with an insatiable desire, and refer all things to the attainment of them. The Psalmist felt this love in his heart, and well expressed it, Psal. xlii. 1, *As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God.* Hence we may conclude, that all they who promise themselves the happiness above, when, in the meanwhile, they do not at all savour the things above, are delighted as by a certain pleasing dream, and never will be satisfied with those things, because they were never wont to thirst or hunger for them at heart. The last branch of this exhortation remains.

Not on things on the earth; supply, *seek and savour.*] The Apostle calls all those things, in which the kingdom of God does not consist, *things of the earth;* as riches, pleasures, honours; and I add, in fine, those ceremonies and observations which centre in things earthly and corporeal: for this hortatory conclusion being drawn from our death and resurrection with Christ, it shews all those things to be of no esteem. But now they are said *to savour of* or *seek earthly things,* who place their happiness in these things, who by these earthly blessings (as they are called) are influenced in all their judgments and decisions. These sensualities are well depicted by the Apostle, in Phil. iii. 18, 19, *Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame,* οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες, *who mind earthly things.* They were men of this kind, whom our Saviour censured in his parable, Luke xiv. because, while they regarded fields, oxen, and wives, altogether neglected the call of salvation.

Hence we may observe,

1. That no one can savour of things heavenly and things of the earth at the same time. For if this could be done, there would have been no need of this clause denying and forbidding it; but it would have been sufficient to

have said, *set your affections on things above,* without its being added, *and not on things of the earth.* But that saying of the Saviour is true, *No man can serve two masters,* Matt. vi. 24. If, therefore, we be slaves to our earthly desires, we shall never be watchful to promote our salvation. The poet heretofore sang, *Our bosoms do not admit two cares;* and the Apostle said, *foolish and hurtful lusts drown men in perdition,* 1 Tim. vi. 9.

2. We must observe, that Paul forbids us to seek and savour earthly things, he does not forbid us to use earthly things, much less, indeed, to obtain them. We cannot live without the use of earthly things; but they would not serve for necessary uses, unless they were before acquired. Therefore, to *seek* and *affect* them, means in this place, to desire them with the whole heart, with every labour and industry: and to acquiesce in those things as in the greatest good. This carnal and worldly men do, whatever they pretend: this is evinced by their coveting these earthly things in every way and without measure. Now it is plain, that that is sought and proposed as their sole end, which is sought immeasurably: for in that which is sought on account of some end, a measure is admitted in proportion to the end.

3. We may add a reason why it is not fit to affect earthly things, but those alone which are above; and that twofold, One taken from the vanity of these things; for earthly things, as Parisiensis has well remarked, *cannot impart satisfaction to him that hath them, nor support to him that rests upon them, nor profit to him who labours for them. What then shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world,* &c. Matt. xvi. 26. The other from their contrariety to true and heavenly pleasures. For, as the heavenly manna failed after the children of Israel had eaten of the fruits of the earth; so the sweetness of spiritual pleasure is not perceived by those who have a longing after these earthly things. Whence said Augustine, *If the mind hath delight from what is external, it will remain without delight from what is internal.* Thus much for the matter of the Apostle's exhortation. Let us proceed to the inducements.

If ye be risen with Christ.] That it is our duty to seek and affect the things which are above he argues, first from our resurrection with Christ: For these words *if ye be risen,* are not expressive of doubt, but the language of inference and conclusion: for the assumption, viz. *ye are risen with Christ,* is presupposed from those things which were contended for in the foregoing Chapter, verses 12 and 13. And this argument proceeds from the cause to the effect: for this our resurrection which we have by Christ, is the efficient principle of the new life, and, therefore, of the new conversation and work. For we must know, that Christ, by the same power wherewith he raised himself from corporeal death, hath raised all his people from spiritual death. Hence said Bernard, *There is a twofold resurrection: one of the soul, which the secret coming of Christ effects; the other of the body, which the glorious coming of Christ will accomplish. And as the outward man will receive in its corporeal resurrection, new life and functions: so in this spiritual resurrection, the inner man now receives new life and a new sensitive power.* Hence that injunction of the Apostle, Rom. vi. 4, *As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life.* This spiritual resurrection is effected in baptism, both sacramentally and really; sacramentally, by the external administration of the rite; really, by the internal operation of the Holy Spirit. The Apostle comprehends both in Tit. iii. 5, *According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.* These things being laid down, it is clear, that this ought to be the greatest inducement to all believers to seek and savour the things which are above. For he who is risen again is risen to another kind of life; but he who is risen with Christ, he, as far as it can be done in this life, ought to imitate Christ rising again. Therefore, like as Christ, being raised from the dead, cared no more for earthly things, but ascended to heaven to live a glorious and heavenly life: so Christians, who are spiritually raised, ought not to cleave to earthly things and desires, but elevate their minds to heaven.

Hence we observe,

1. It is the duty of Christians to imitate Christ, and to do those things spiritually which Christ did corporeally. For instance; Christ died; we ought in like manner to die to sin: Christ rose again; we ought also to rise to newness of life: Christ ascended into heaven; it is our duty to soar to heaven in mind. This is what the Apostle would have us understand in Rom. vii. 5, where he requires that we, being planted together, should coalesce together in conformity as well to the death as to the resurrection of Christ. *The Apostle,* says Chrysostom, *would have Christians to be partakers with Christ in all things.*

2. It is not only our duty to rise with Christ; but to derive power from the resurrection of Christ for this spiritual resurrection; for that virtue wherewith Christ raised himself, he communicates to all his people to raise up them also. The argument, therefore, from the resurrection of Christ is strong for our spiritual resurrection. Hence the Apostle, having laid down the death and resurrection of Christ, subjoins Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε, &c. *Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Rom. vi. 11.

3. They are now inexcusable who still are absorbed in earthly things and desires; since they have a new nature proportioned and inclined to the things which are above, communicated to them by the quickening power of the resurrection of Christ. Therefore, like as iron, which cannot raise itself aloft by its nature, yet, by the operation of the magnet acting upon it, is raised upward: so human minds, by their own aptitude being set upon earthly things, by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, can elevate themselves to high and heavenly things. Thus much for the first inducement.

Where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.] This is that other inducement or spur to seek and affect lofty or celestial things: Christ sitteth at the right hand of God; therefore it behoves us to seek and to affect the things that are above. First we shall explain the meaning of these

words; and then shew the force of the argument, or the consequence of the reason.

In the first place, then, it must be borne in mind, that this is spoken of Christ properly and especially as to his human nature, in which he rose, and ascended, and sits at the right hand of the Father, as it is stated in the Apostle's Creed: and although as to the Divine nature, we must believe that he sat at the right hand of the Father from all eternity, i. e. as Damascenus, Lib. 4. cap. 2, has expounded it, that he had an equality of Divine Majesty with God the Father: *By the right hand of the Father we mean the glory and honour of the Godhead; in which the Son of God existed, before the world began, as God, and of one substance with the Father, but became incarnate in these last days, and sitteth there bodily, his flesh being also glorified.* Therefore, passing by this Exposition of Damascenus, which respects the Divine nature of Christ and his eternal Majesty, let us inquire what is intimated under the words *to sit at the right hand of God,* when they are applied to the human nature of Christ and its exaltation effected in time.

This is the sum; Since God hath no bodily right hand, by this sitting is signified, that Christ as man, having accomplished the work of our redemption, is not only endowed with immortality and perfect blessedness, but is raised to heaven, placed above all creatures, Lord, Governor, and Judge of the whole world, and especially constituted the most glorious and powerful King and Patron of the Church. Augustine, De fide et symbolo, Tom. 3, says, *to sit, is to possess judicial power; but to be at the right hand of God, is to be in the highest blessedness; as to be at the left hand is to be in the deepest misery.* But what it is for the man Christ to sit at the right hand of the Father, is best explained by the Apostle in Ephes. i. 20, 21, and 22. It comprises, then, the exaltation of the human nature to a state of the completest happiness and glory of which it could be capable, and likewise exaltation and authority over all other creatures.

The error of certain moderns is therefore to be avoided,

who, from this sitting of Christ at the right hand of God, endeavour to infer, that Divine Majesty, ubiquity, and all the properties of Deity are really *communicated* to the human nature of Christ. But they are easily refuted;

1. Because, if the Divine attributes be really communicated to the human nature, the human nature is really God: for the Divine attributes are nothing else than the Divine essence. We therefore acknowledge that Christ incarnate has an equality of glory and majesty with God the Father: but we deny that the flesh of Christ, or the human nature, has, or can have this; because it is not consubstantial with God, although it is hypostatically united to God.

2. They are refuted from the circumstance of time. For (as they will have it) a real communication of attributes to the human nature arises from its hypostatic union with the Divine: but this sitting of the man Christ at the right hand of God, of which the Apostle speaks, followed his passion and resurrection. This we learn from the order of the articles in the Apostle's Creed: *He rose again; he ascended into heaven; he sat down,* &c. This Christ himself teaches us, Luke xxiv. 26, *Ought not Christ to have suffered, and to enter into his glory?* And the Apostle, Heb. i. 3, *After that he had purged our sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.*

3. As to the ubiquity of Christ's body; that is manifestly refuted, not established in this place. For the Apostle says, that the minds of Christians ought to be directed heavenward, not set upon earthly things, for this reason, that Christ is exalted at the right hand of God in the heavens, now no more to dwell with us upon earth in his bodily presence, although as to the presence of the Divine Majesty he is ever with us. Thus in Ephes. i. 20, *He set Christ at his own right hand.* Where? *In the heavens;* and Heb. i. 3, *in the highest places.* Although, therefore, the right hand of God is every where, if thereby we understand the Divine Majesty and power; because God is every where: yet Christ, as far as regards his body, or his human nature, is set at the right hand of God, not as regards his ubiquity, but his presence in heaven.

And thus ye see briefly in what sense Christ is set at the right hand of God: His Divine nature, or the person of *the Word,* sits in the equality of Majesty and glory, and of all the Divine attributes; the human nature sits above all created things, but yet beneath God, viz. endued with majesty, and the greatest glory adapted to it, and of which it can be capable.

Those things being explained, it remains that we shew the force of this argument: Christ sitteth on high at the right hand of God; therefore we ought to seek and affect the things which are above. There are two reasons which strengthen this consequence. The first derived from the love of all the faithful to the Head and Saviour Christ Jesus. It is a common saying, *The mind is where it loves, not where its actual seat is:* and that saying in the Gospel is also well known, *Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also,* Matt. vi. 21. Since then Christ, who is the love and delight of the souls of the faithful, is placed in the heavens at the right hand of God, it is needful for every pious and holy soul to flee towards that celestial place as by a straight course, and in heart and mind especially to have conversation there daily. That saying of Paul, Phil. i. 23, *I have a desire to depart and to be with Christ,* flowed from this affection. The inferior members can never be well if they be disjointed and separated from their head: it is no wonder, therefore, if all the faithful mount to heaven as much as they can, and strive to join themselves to Christ their Head.

The other cause is derived from the influence of the head over the members. For Christ sits not idle at the right hand of the Father, but imparts saving grace to all his people, and supplies them with strength to trample under foot earthly things, and seek those which are above. For Christ being exalted hath attractive virtue, he draws all his people upward, and suffers them not to cleave to the earth. Even as the heavenly sun draws upwards by his power, gross and earthly vapours; so Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, separates our gross and rigid souls from the dregs of earthly things, and by his efficacious working raises them to heavenly. The argument, therefore, is derived from what is possible or

feasible: as though he had said, Although ye cannot by the strength of nature seek and affect the things that are above, yet by the aid of Christ sitting at the right hand of God, and drawing you to himself by the Spirit of grace, ye are now able to accomplish that. *I can do all things,* says the Apostle, *through Christ strengthening me,* Phil. iv. 13.

Hence we infer,

1. There is no reason why we should fear the hosts of our spiritual enemies, the devil, the world, and the flesh; because Christ our Saviour is more powerful than all these, inasmuch as he is exalted at the right hand of God, far above all creatures. *What fear of the world is there to him, who hath God for his guide through the world?* Cyprian, De Orat. Dom. *Human persecution shall not shake the mind, but Divine protection shall strengthen faith.* Idem, De exhort. martyr. cap. 10.

2. This ought to induce a perpetual exercise of faith, that as often as we are troubled with earthly desires, forthwith we should look up to heaven, we should contemplate Christ sitting at the right hand of God, and seek spiritual strength from him. Thus Stephen was even supported against the very terrors of death, Acts vii. 55.

3. They are not true and living members under Christ the Head, whose minds are not directed heavenward. *For wheresoever the carcase is, thither will the eagles be gathered together,* Matt. xxiv. 28.

So much for the inducements to seek those things which are above.

Verses 3, 4.

For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God; When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.

That the things which are above were to be sought by the Colossians, and so by all believers, is proved by two reasons; from our resurrection with Christ, and from the

exaltation of Christ himself. The Apostle now enters upon that other part of his admonition, by which he forbids us to seek and to affect earthly things; and he corroborates it by two other arguments. The first taken from our spiritual death; *for ye are dead:* to which he adds a silent occupation; *your life is hid.* The latter is derived from the certain expectation of future glory. And this certainty is shewn by the circumstance of the time assigned when this life of glory shall be given us; namely, *when Christ shall appear.* We shall begin from the former reason.

For ye are dead] Namely, to sin, to the world, and to the flesh; as the Apostle constantly testifies. *Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin,* Rom. vi. 11. *The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world,* Gal. vi. 14; And elsewhere, *They who are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.* Here let us consider two things: How we are dead; and, How much this consideration prevails to the slighting of earthly things.

As to the first; They that are born again are dead to sin, not because sin is wholly eradicated and extirpated from their mortal body; for this would oppose every one's experience who perceives within himself the fuel of sin: but because its dominion is broken, weakened, and debilitated; because its power is gradually subdued by the operation of grace; because at length it shall be wholly overcome and extinguished by the perfection of glory. Whoever, therefore, are born again in Christ are dead to sin, because all their sins are abolished, in the sacrament of regeneration, as to the guilt; because they are sealed to be entirely abolished, even as to the act, and begin to be abolished by the Spirit operating within; finally, because believers are bound to mortify them, on account of the vow of mortification undertaken at baptism. Therefore, as in common language we say that he is *already a dead man,* against whom sentence of death is passed; so we rightly say, that they who are born again *are dead,* or that sin *is already dead* in them, because in their baptism the sentence of death was as it were passed against sin; the execution of which sentence is forthwith begun, is daily proceeding, and at

length completed. It was not badly said by Parisiensis, De legib. cap. 28, *All sin is reckoned to be dead that hath not extinguished the life of grace; wherefore it is accounted dead, since it is not permitted to rule.* It would be easy to confirm this by many testimonies of the Scriptures. For they every where teach, that those who are born again in baptism not only die to sin sacramentally, but also receive the Spirit of Christ, by whose virtue and efficacy the lusts of the flesh are really mortified in them. Rom. vi. 6, *We know that our old man is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin might be destroyed.* They moreover teach, that we stipulated with God, to the perpetual study of mortification and a godly life: Thus speaks Peter, Epis. i. cap. iii. 21, where he calls baptism *the answer of a good conscience towards God.* We now understand what the Apostle meant with himself, when he says that the Colossians *are dead;* and in what sense Christians are said *to be dead to sin* by their baptism.

Now it remains that we examine, in the second place, the reason of this consequence, *Ye ought not to seek, or set your affections on earthly things, because ye are dead:* Which is most forcible on many accounts.

First, it prevails from the removal of the cause to the removal of the effect. For the effects of the dominion of sin are *to savour and to seek earthly things:* but in those who are dead to sin, sin has lost this lordly power: it cannot, therefore, compel them to unlawful lusts. The Apostle affirms this in express words, Rom. vi. 7, *He who is dead is free from sin:* and ver. 14, *Sin shall not have dominion over you.* This may be illustrated from the similitude of a tyrant who formerly flourished and domineered, but was afterward wounded, subdued, and cast into prison. For as he, whilst protected by his guards, held the citadel, ruled the miserable citizens, and compelled them to obey his commands; but after he had been stripped of his defence, forced from his citadel, overcome, and bound, was derided and despised by all, neither had any one who regarded his directions: so sin, whilst it lives in the unregenerate man, urges and impels him to all wickedness; but after its dominion is broken, it can do nothing except to those who voluntarily give up themselves to it again.

Secondly, when the Apostle reasons, *Ye are dead, therefore ye ought to savour earthly things,* an argument is deduced by a *simile.* For as bodily death severs men from all commerce with earthly things, so this spiritual mortification ought to estrange our minds from the study and desire of earthly things. Bodily death of necessity wrests men from all worldly concerns; spiritual mortification, by a certain divine operation, withdraws us from the love of these things: To be dead, then, means this, that they who have the Holy Spirit mortifying within them the lusts of the flesh, are able, by his assistance, to despise earthly things, and desire those that are heavenly. Paul affords a remarkable specimen of this, who was so much removed from the desire of earthly glory, as to regard as dung whatever is desirable and glorious in the eyes of the world.

Lastly, the Apostle's conclusion is supported by what is *honourable* and *due.* It is *honourable,* that they who have died sacramentally in baptism, should shew in their life that they are really mortified. It is *due,* that they who have vowed the mortification of the flesh in baptism, should exercise the duty of mortification by a contempt of earthly things. And thus ye see this consequence, *Seek not earthly things, because ye are dead,* is most firmly sustained by the force of many reasons. Now let us deduce some observations or doctrines.

1. A Christian serving the lusts of sin, is a deserter and voluntary captive. For he is delivered from the service of sin, this tyrant being weakened and smitten with a deadly wound. See the miserable and shameful condition of these in 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20: *Of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.*

2. There is no cause why a Christian should despond, because he perceives in himself the rebellious motion of sin, unless he obeys its lusts, and is himself drawn headlong into rebellion. For, notwithstanding these enticements of sin, he who neither yields the consent of the will,

nor the members of his body as instruments of iniquity thereto, is accounted *dead to sin.*

3. The Apostle requires that we should duly hold the mystery of our baptism, and transfer it to the use of piety and holiness. For he derives this most beautiful exhortation, *Seek not the things that are on earth, because ye are dead,* from the consideration of baptism, as it will appear to those who look back to the 12th verse of the foregoing Chapter. So in Rom. vi. 3, *Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?* as though he had said, It is shameful and unworthy of a Christian not to know this.

4. They grievously sin who suffer their baptism to be rooted from their memory, as a transient ceremony: for this sacred mystery, although once performed, should be perpetually revolved in mind, and expressed in conduct.

Let us proceed to the next clause.

And your life is hid with Christ in God.] It has been said that there is an implied occupation contained in these words, whereby he meets a twofold objection.

1. It is objected, That the Apostle contradicts himself: he had just now said that the Colossians were risen; but those who are risen again are alive: now in almost the same breath he affirms that they are dead; but the dead are not alive.

This difficulty is solved by distinguishing, They are dead to the world, to sin, and the flesh, as was before shewn; but they live to God and Christ. The same Spirit who mortifies the carnal life within us, quickens us to a new and spiritual life. And this is that life which all those live by Christ who are dead to sin.

2. It might be said that Paul opposes common experience. For all the pious perceive themselves as yet infested by the remains of sin, oppressed by various sorrows, and at length fall under death: How, therefore, can it be true, that they are risen with Christ and follow a new life?

The Apostle answers, that this new life is, in fact, only begun, and is imperfect and obscure in the faithful themselves: but in Christ their Head it is completed, perfected,

glorious; yet hidden. Therefore, Paul would anticipate these objections in saying, *Your life is hid with Christ in God.* Let us now examine the words themselves respectively.

Your life.] The word *life* is taken for that supernatural life whereby we live *to* God under a state of grace, and whereby we are to live *with* God in a state of glory: For the life of grace is nothing else (so to speak) than the childhood of glory. And both these are called *your life* by way of eminence; in comparison of which a carnal and bodily life is considered as death: for a carnal life leads to death, and that eternal. Whence in the holy Scriptures they are accounted dead who live after the flesh; *Let the dead bury their dead:* and 1 Tim. v. 6, *She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* Moreover, he who lives the life of grace according as he is led by the Spirit, he day by day ripens for eternity, Rom. viii. 13. And as the carnal life of sinners is death, if it be compared to the spiritual life of the faithful; so the natural life of man is death, if it is compared to the supernatural life of the blessed. For this whole bodily life passes away and vanishes any moment, nor has it any permanency; but that whole supernatural life stands in the perpetuity of its solidity, and hath nothing transient. Therefore, the Apostle intending this spiritual and supernatural life, rightly and emphatically says, *Your life.*

Is hid.] This may be applied as well to the life of grace as to the life of glory. The spiritual life of the saints is hid, First, as to the wicked. For the world does not discover any thing spiritual in the children of God; but accounts them the most despicable, foolish, and miserable beings. So says the Apostle, Heb. xi. 36—38, *They had trials of mockings and scourgings, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, of whom the world was not worthy.* Neither is it to be wondered at, since this spiritual life consists in those things which meet not the eye or sense; namely, in adoption, in regeneration, in union with Christ, in faith and love, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit. Hence that tardy confession of the ungodly, Wisdom v. 3, &c. *These*

are they whom we had sometime in derision and a proverb of reproach. We fools accounted their life madness, and their end to be without honour. How are they numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints!

Secondly, as to the saints and faithful themselves, their spiritual life is hid; but partly, not entirely. I say it is in some measure hid, because they themselves do not always clearly perceive the life of grace in them; but sometimes, being assaulted by the temptations of the devil and the flesh, they are half in doubt that they themselves are indeed slain, and destitute of the Spirit of God. Hence that word of the Psalmist li. 10, *Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.* Moreover, when they perceive in themselves this spiritual life, they nevertheless acknowledge it to be very weak, languid, and obscure on account of that perpetual resistance and rebellion of the flesh. So Paul felt that he *delighted in the law of God after the inner man;* Here we see his spiritual life! yet the same Paul *sees another law in his members warring against the law of his mind;* Here we see the same life hidden and obscured! Rom. vii. 22, 23.

Now as to the life of future glory, that is much more hidden: For although we have the seeds of this life within us, yet they are trodden down under this mortal body, neither are they brought into full light before the day of Christ's coming. In the meanwhile, as it is in 1 John iii. 2, *We are now the children of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be:* nay, we are not indeed able to take in even in imagination this hidden life, 1 Cor. ii. 9.

With Christ in God.] This also fitly accords both to the spiritual life to which we are now raised, as well as to that glorious life to which we are to be raised; for each is hidden in Christ, as in the fountain, the root, or original. But these words *in God,* are added, because Christ himself, as man, hath withdrawn himself from the earth, and ascended to God the Father. Therefore, God is invisible and hidden from the world, and Christ with God, and our life with Christ. As to spiritual life, it is certain that whatever small streams are derived to us, the fountain itself

lies hid in Christ; nay, the streams of spiritual life are not derived to us, except so far as we are joined to Christ, in whom this life is laid up. *I live,* says the Apostle, *yet not I, but Christ liveth in me,* Gal. ii. 20. Hence is that declaration John xv. 5, 6, *If a man abide not in Christ and Christ in him, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered.* But our life of glory is also hid in Christ. For as the life of the branches is not extinct in the season of winter, but is hidden in the root of the vine itself: so the blessed and glorious life of the faithful is hidden and reserved in Christ, the spiritual vine, in this season of their earthly pilgrimage. Nay, and we also are said, in this sense, to be already put into possession of this celestial life, namely, as we are already raised to heaven in Christ the Head, and endued with eternal life and immortality. This is what the Apostle would have us to understand in Ephes. ii. 6, *He hath raised us up together with him, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.* In Christ, therefore, as man, our celestial life is hid, as in the modelling cause: for he shall *change our humble body, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body,* Phil. iii. 21.* It is also hidden as in the material and meritorious cause: for he hath expiated our sins by his death in the flesh, and merited for us this life. *In the Son,* therefore, *is* that *eternal life* which God hath bestowed on us, 1 John v. 11. It is hidden, lastly, in the man Christ, as in the efficient, that is to say, the secondary and instrumental cause. Moreover all supernatural life is hidden in God, as in the principal cause and

* Our translation of this fine passage is not very happy. Bishop Horsley gives the following; which is here copied for the sake of the impressive remark subjoined to it, and its suitability to the tenor of our Expositor's observations:—" *Who shall cause the fashion of our body of humiliation to be made like unto his body of glory, according to the energy of his power of subduing all things to himself.*—This transformation of the bodies of the faithful, by the power of our Lord, requires a previous transformation of the mind to a resemblance of him, by faith in his word, by reliance on his atonement, by conformity to his precepts, and imitation of his example. For he that hath this hope in him, of being transformed into the likeness of his Lord, of seeing him as he now is, and of standing for ever in his presence; he that hath this hope 'purifieth himself even as He is pure.' "

chief fountain. The Apostle unites each cause, both primary and instrumental, in Rom. vi. 23, *The gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

In conclusion,

1. We are hence taught, as often as we perceive spiritual grace languish within us, to seek a fresh supply from Christ, in whom is hid the fountain of spiritual life.

2. Hence it is seen how necessary it is to be united with Christ by faith and the Spirit: for if we are separated from him, we are not Christians, but the dead carcases of Christians; because in him is hidden all our life.

3. Here we have relief under our infirmity and imperfection; because, although all spiritual things in us are weak and imperfect, as faith, love, and holiness; yet, through Christ, we have spiritual life perfected in all things. This is the consideration whereby St. Paul sustained himself, Phil. iii. 8, 9, *I count all things but dung, that I may win Christ; and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness,* &c.

4. Here we have most suitable consolation, and the firmest anchor to our hope in all external miseries. For our life is laid up in God; but God will not deny the deposit: it is hid with Christ; but it is impossible that Christ and life be separated; it is no less impossible that they should perish whose life is hid with Christ. Let us conclude, therefore, that heavenly things are to be sought by us, earthly things to be trodden under foot; because we are both dead to these earthly things, and have a supernatural life as well of grace as of glory hidden with Christ in God.

Vers. 4. *When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*

The Apostle proceeds still further to shew that earthly things are not to be sought or savoured by Christians, but heavenly ones. He derives his argument from the expectation of the glory destined for us. We shall consider

first, the matter contained in these words in itself: secondly, we shall shew the force of the consequence; that it may be understood how it tends to establish this conclusion, Earthly things are not to be affected by us.

In the former part three things are to be considered: the Author of the gift; the time of the bestowal; the gift itself.

1. The Author, or the Cause of the glorious and blessed life which we expect, is Christ himself: Whence he is called *our life* by a causal not an essential predication; because it was he that promised this life to us, it was he that merited it for us, it was he prepared it, he that will bestow it. He promisd it, in the name of the Father, Luke xii. 32, *Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom;* and in his own name, John x. 28, *I give unto them eternal life,* &c. He merited it, 1 John iv. 9, *God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him;* and 1 John v. 11, *God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.* And he hath prepared us for this life, and this eternal life for us. He hath prepared us, and made us meet for the participation of this life by his Spirit; *He hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light,* Col. i. 12. *He hath quickened us together with Christ: by grace ye are saved,* Ephes. ii. 5. He hath also prepared this kingdom for us by his ascension; *I go to prepare a place for you: And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself; that where I am, there ye may be also,* John xiv. 23. Finally, he will bestow upon his people this crown of eternal life; *Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him,* John xvii. 2. *There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord shall give me,* 2 Tim. iv. 8. Christ, then is rightly called *our life,* i. e. the author or the cause of our eternal life: as it is in Heb. v. 9, *And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.*

2. Now let us consider the circumstances of time: *When he shall appear,* THEN we shall obtain a glorious life.

The revealing, or manifestation, or appearing of Christ, is propounded in a threefold manner in the Scriptures:

First, he is manifested bodily in the flesh, to the bodily eyes of men, in his nativity. Whence Simeon, Luke ii. 30, congratulates himself on the bodily sight of Christ: *Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation. God was manifest in the flesh,* 1 Tim. iii. 16.

Secondly, he is manifested spiritually in the preaching of the Gospel, to the spiritual eyes of believers. Of this manifestation Paul speaks in Gal. iii. 1, *Who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth.* And in John, 1 Epist. i. 2, *The life was made manifest,* &c.

Thirdly, he remains to be manifested to the whole world in the splendour of his glory, by his coming to judge the living and the dead. Of this final manifestation the Apostle is speaking: for unto this day the glorification of his saints is deferred, doubtless to be perfected then. *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth,* Job xix. 25. And 1 Cor. xv. 52, 53, *The trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal immortality.* This, then, is that festal day of which the Apostle subjoins a clear and most delightful promise in these words following,

3. *Then shall ye also appear with him in glory,* or *glorious*] That is, Then shall ye each be made like to your glorious Head and Saviour Jesus Christ. The promised glory of this eternal life (if I may speak with the Schoolmen) consists in a twofold array; in the robe of the soul, and the robe of the body. The robe of the soul consists, First, in the manifest vision of God, which succeeds to faith; according to that declaration of the Apostle, *Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face,* 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Secondly, in that perfect fruition, which succeeds to hope: *They shall neither hunger, nor thirst; since the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall*

wipe away all tears from their eyes, Rev. vii. 16. Thirdly, in the perfect love of God, which succeeds to our imperfect love, and shall perfect it for ever: *Prophecies shall fail, tongues shall cease; but love never faileth,* 1 Cor. xiii. 8. But indeed, what of glory and of happiness shall it not comprise? To see, to love, to enjoy God! we are not only not able to express it, but we cannot comprehend it in our mind: For truly says Gregory, Moral 27. 26, *When mortal man would discourse about eternal glory, he disputes as one blind about light.*

That glorious robe of the body consists in the various endowments with which it shall then be adorned: In brightness; *The righteous shall shine forth as the sun,* Matt. xiii. 43: in exemption from suffering; *this corruptible shall put on incorruption,* 1 Cor. xv. 53: in agility; which, according to Augustine, shall be such, that *wherever the spirit flies, there shall the body also forthwith be.* Other things were likewise added by some of the Schoolmen; but it is not my purpose with over nicety to define any thing about these matters; that saying of the Apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 43, 44, shall suffice, *It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body.* If any one desires to see more about the state of the blessed, let him consult Prosper, De vit. contempl. lib. i. cap. 4; Parisiensis, De universo; Albert, Compend. lib. vii. cap. 23, 24, &c. Thomæ Summ. part. iii. qu. 82. art. 1, 2, &c.

And thus much concerning the gift of glory, the time of the bestowment, and Christ the giver thereof. Now, in the second place, we shall consider how wonderfully all these things conduce to the contempt of earthly, and the desire of heavenly things.

First, then, that state of glory promised to us and daily expected, ought to move us to despise earthly things. For if the heirs of an earthly king should disdain to be occupied in low and abject employments; how much more does it behove those destined for a celestial kingdom, to tread under foot the lusts of earthly things? That saying of Alexander is worthy of remembrance, who, when invited

to a contest of running with certain plebeians, said, that it was not befitting the son of a king to enter the course except with kings. It behoves us also to maintain this royal temper, and to resolve that we cannot, in conformity with the dignity of our condition, engage with worldly minded men in the contest for earthly things; but that we ought so to frame our course with the sons of God and co-heirs of heaven, as to seek and obtain heavenly things. This is what Christ advised; *Take no thought, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed? for after all these things do the Gentiles seek: but seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness,* Matt. vi. 31. *A saint, while he seeks after eternity alone, holds beneath him every thing transitory,* says Gregory, Moral 1. 3. 14.

Secondly, if we seriously consider who is the bestower of this glorious crown, that likewise will excite us to despise earthly things. Christ our life, as we before shewed, promised it, he merited it, he will assign this crown of glory: But to whom? to those who seek and delight in earthly things? By no means; but to those who *seek the things that are above,* and *love his appearing,* 2 Tim. iv. 8. It is proper to expect the reward from him for whom you have fought: if for the world, the flesh, or the devil, expect no other reward than death: if for Christ, then, and then only, it will be lawful to hope for glory in the end: *He who soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he who soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting,* Gal. vi. 8. Admirably spake Bernard: *There is no road to the kingdom, without the first-fruits of the kingdom; nor can that man hope for the kingdom of heaven, who has not yet obtained the dominion over his own lusts.* So 1 John iii. 2, 3, *When Christ shall appear, we shall be like him:* And *whosoever hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure.* But Christ was as pure from the lusts of earthly things as could possibly be: for he would not yield the least inclination of his body to the devil, to obtain thereby *all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them,* Matt. iv. Thus we ought to be animated, if we expect life eternal from Christ our life.

Thirdly, the circumstances of the time in which we expect this glorious life is a most powerful inducement to withdraw our minds from the love of earthly things. For when shall this crown of glory be given? *When he shall appear,* i. e. on the day of the coming of the Lord. Now this day, if we believe the Scriptures, will come both quickly and suddenly.

Quickly; *Yet a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry,* Heb. x. 37. And Rev. xxii. 12, *Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me.* It ought not, then, to seem troublesome or burdensome to regulate the short period of our time, and to abstain from earthly things, when Christ is at hand, and promises us eternal glory. *The hireling, because he ponders heavily his drudgery, thinks lightly of the reward,* says Gregory, Moral, 8. 8. *Be patient,* therefore, *and stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh,* Jas. v. 8.

That day shall likewise come suddenly: *As the light shineth from heaven, so shall the Son of Man be in his day,* Luke xvii. 24. *The day of the Lord will come as a thief,* 2 Pet. iii. 10. Now then who does not see how dangerous it is to be involved in earthly things and desires, and so to be taken unawares? Christ foresees this our danger, and forewarns us to avoid it; *Be ye like unto men that wait for their Lord when he will return from the wedding,* &c. Luke xii. 36. *Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame,* Rev. xvi. 15. What, then, will become of us, if we are taken unawares immersed in all these earthly things? Hear Gregory; *He who would not go with the stream, let him avoid the torrent; lest by that which allures him, he be carried to that which he avoids: for he is drawn to the same point to which he inclines,* Moral 22. 2.

And thus it has been briefly shewn, that whether we consider the gift itself of eternal glory, or the giver, or the time of giving, all and every one of these considerations ought to withdraw us from the love of earthly things, and excite us constantly to seek and to meditate on heavenly things. It now remains that from the whole we deduce

some corollaries, as well for instruction as for correction, and then finally for our consolation.

Instructions arising from this verse.

1. God will have Christ his Son to be the fountain and the bestower of this glorious life to all his faithful members: it is, therefore, not to be hoped for or supplicated from any others.

2. This Christ, being exalted to heaven, is removed from our sight: he is therefore to be apprehended by the eye of faith: and this ought to be the perpetual exercise of the pious, to soar towards heaven, to contemplate Christ glorified, and to render the assurance of that future glory certain to themselves.

3. The happiness of Christians is not placed in the things of the present life, but the whole depends upon the expectation of future things. *The resurrection of the dead is the confidence of Christians,* says Tertullian. Therefore there is need of special faith.

Consolations.

1. Not we ourselves, but Christ is the keeper of the eternal life promised to us: Therefore, although we are compelled to tremble, as often as we consider our frail condition in ourselves; yet, as often as we meditate on the most firm and faithful care of Christ, we send forth that triumphant voice of faith, *I know that there is a crown laid up for me.*

2. This glory in reserve for the pious is able to assuage all temporal calamities. Cyprian, writing against Demetrian, admirably treats this matter; he says, *He, whose entire joy and glory is in the world, suffers from worldly adversity: he, to whom there can be no well-being after the world, mourns under worldly misfortune.* But the faithful bravely endure the ills and misfortunes of the world, whilst they look forward to future good and happiness. Vide Habbac. iii. 17, 18.

3. Nothing that is of any moment and worth can be snatched from the pious man. Against our good things (as they are called) of fortune, even against this frail life,

the ungodly may prevail: but against the good things promised, and our eternal life nothing can prevail.

Reproofs.

1. They are to be blamed, who, either never think, or think not with joy of Christ and the coming of Christ. For who can excuse their torpor who do not ardently desire the life of his life, who do not wait for that natal day of this new life with gladness?

2. And they also are deservedly to be blamed who seek the glory of this world: for what else is this than to wish to violate this Divine decree? He has decreed that the glory of Christians is to be expected on the second coming of Christ. In the meanwhile, it behoves us to bear the injuries and miseries of time, to dream not here of glory and happiness, unless hereafter to hear with Dives, *Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented,* Luke xvi. 25.

3. They are to be derided, or rather to be pitied as the madmen of this world, who think themselves happy because they enjoy the pleasures, the honours, the wealth of this world; and think the pious, on the contrary, to be most abject and miserable, because they, for the most part, are destitute. But those are not truly happy, for whom eternal misery remains, nor those miserable, whom eternal glory awaits. Well said Lactantius, Instit. 6. 22, *As we arrive at true good through fallacious evils, so we come to real evil through fallacious good.* And thus we dismiss the first member of the general exhortation.

Verse 5.

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry.

Having gone through that former part of the exhortation which teaches us what is to be sought without us, and what to be avoided; the Apostle proceeds, and teaches what is to be extirpated and abolished within us, what is to be nourished and cherished. That former part directed us to seek the true end, viz. celestial blessedness; this directs us to enter upon the path which leads thereto, namely, true holiness. Now of this exhortation, which calls us to the life of holiness, there are two parts. In the former, he excites the Colossians to lay aside or to put off vicious actions and affections; in the latter, to put on and exercise good ones. And the Apostle, in this and the following verse, persuades us to mortify, first, carnal vices, which immediately respect our peculiar, but unlawful pleasures; secondly, in the verses which follow, spiritual vices, which tend immediately to the injury of our neighbour. But let us come to this fifth verse.

The Apostle here does two things: First, he proposes a general exhortation to the study of mortification; Secondly, a particular enumeration of certain vicious deeds and affections which he would have to be mortified.

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth.] In these words you have the general exhortation to the practice of mortification. We may observe in them,

First, the connexion or dependence of the words; for the illative particle *therefore*, compels us to look to what goes before. They are thus then connected with the foregoing words: Because *ye are risen with Christ*, because *ye are dead with Christ*, because *ye have a glorious life hid in Christ*, THEREFORE *mortify your members*, &c. Hence we infer that our participation with Christ in dying, rising again, and ascending, is the strongest inducement to newness of life and holiness.

Secondly. Let us consider the act itself to which we

are invited, expressed in this word, *mortify*, i. e. make the body of the old Adam as a dead carcase; that, although it may retain certain members and lineaments, yet they are inefficacious, being destitute of life and motion; i. e. *Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;* Rom. vi. 12. This our mortification, therefore, is nothing else than the study and the practice of repressing our corrupt nature, and restraining all unlawful actions and affections which are wont to spring from thence. But in this study these three things are involved: a serious determination of resisting sin; an avoiding of the occasions which are wont to induce us to sin; a careful use of all means which tend to the subduing of sin. A good determination averts the heart itself from the ways of sin; a diligent avoiding of it causes us not to return to it; the use of means, that we should be constant in our determination, and proceed happily.

But since the Apostle exhorts us to mortify our members, it may here be asked, 1st. Is mortification a human work, or of the human will? The Apostle seems clearly to assert it in this place: but the whole Scripture proclaims our mortification and vivification to be the effects of the Divine power alone, produced by the Holy Spirit regenerating and inspiring new life into men. *Which are born not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God,* John i. 13. *We are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works,* Ephes. ii. 10. Rightly said Gerson, part. 3, *God not only quickens the dead in sins, but stirs up the affections of the soul to a desire for this quickening.* And Augustine, *The freedom of the will does not prevail in those things which pertain to God, but only in the works respecting the present life,* Contra Pelag. hypognost. lib. 3.

We shall easily solve this difficulty, if we will consider what sort of persons those were of whom the Apostle is here speaking. For he is speaking not of the profane and the dead in sins; but of Christians, i. e. those whom he presumes to be regenerate: and he commands *them* to *mortify their members,* &c. Therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, we must admit the existence of a twofold mortification: First, that which we may call *habitual* or *internal,*

and this is the work of the Divine Spirit alone, infusing it where he will: but this mortification he effects whilst he infuses himself into the human soul together with the gifts of his grace, by the efficacy of which the power and dominion of sin is mortified and overthrown. Secondly, that which we call *external* or *practical;* and this is the work of the renewed man himself, whilst by the aid of the Spirit, he brings forth the fruits of that internal mortification, that is, whilst he resists the temptations of sin, whilst he restrains inordinate affections, whilst he diligently takes care lest he fall into unlawful deeds; for he who does this is said to mortify his flesh. Therefore, the act of mortification attributed to us is nothing else than the ἐνέργεια, or operation springing from infused grace, even that which we have called the *internal* or *habitual* mortification effected by the Holy Spirit.

2. It is again asked, How this Apostolic exhortation agrees with the preceding? He had said, ver. 3, that they *were dead,* now he adds, *Mortify your members:* but what necessity is there that any one dead should be still ordered to mortify himself?

The solution depends upon what was before said. First, then, we answer, that the Colossians were dead *sacramentally* by having received baptism; but are bidden to mortify their members *actually,* viz. in the conversation of life: now these things are accordant, not contradictory. Secondly, we say that they were moreover dead by *habitual* mortification, viz. through the effect of internal mortification infused into their hearts by the Holy Spirit: and they ought to mortify themselves by a *practical* mortification, exercising infused grace in opposing their lusts. Thirdly, we also add, that the cause of natural death and spiritual mortification are different. He who has undergone natural death is vainly commanded any more to mortify himself daily; because natural death is pure privation, and admits not in the subject of it any thing contrary: but spiritual mortification is not pure privation; for whilst we carry this mortal body, every thing inducing to the contrary is to be relinquished, because it must be perpetually

resisted and mortified more and more: Well spake Origen, in Epist. ad Romanos: *The mortification of sin is not effected in a moment, but is the work of an unceasing struggle. Sin languishes from the commencement of our mortification, it wastes away in the progress, at last (i. e. in our death) it shall be abolished.* Lastly, it is not unseasonably answered, that the dead are commanded still to mortify themselves, because if they neglect the constant practice of mortification, vices that were trodden under and subdued recover their strength; corruption that was broken off sprouts anew; and the grace of the Holy Spirit being stifled, the man returns to his former course. This is illustrated by Chrysostom in an elegant similitude: *As a man who has cleansed and polished a statue which had been covered and corroded with dust and filth, may truly say that it is cleaned, and yet properly direct it to be wiped every day, because such direction refers to that soiling which will adhere afresh to the statue if it be neglected: so the Apostle truly said that the Colossians were dead to sin, yet wisely admonishes them to mortify daily the works of the flesh; because this admonition refers to those impure desires which will grow up afresh, and prevail, unless repressed by constant and diligent labour.* Thus much respecting the act of mortification, to which ye see that those who are already dead to sin are not excited in vain.

3. *Your members which are upon the earth.*] He passes from the act to the object about which this practical mortification ought to be exercised. Let us, therefore, in the third place, consider this object; and since every word here used by the Apostle hath great meaning in itself, we shall examine each singly.

Members.] As to this first word we must point out two things: First, what the Apostle intended by *members;* Secondly, what is the reason of this epithet. He calls, then, all vicious and inordinate dispositions, desires, motions, and acts of corrupt nature, *members:* for all these are to be mortified by us, i. e. opposed, subdued, repressed. The primary members of this our corrupt nature are three: the darkness and vanity of the intellect; the depravity and obliquity of the will; the rebellion of the inferior appe-

tites and their proneness to sin. To these are allied innumerable inferior members, and which, as it were, depend upon them, some of these are soon after subjoined in this place, and more occur in Galat. v. 19—21, where, the name being changed, they are called *works of the flesh.*

Now let us see why they are termed *members.* It is usual to adduce three causes for this title.

First, because the old Adam, or the mass of corrupt nature dwelling in us, is compared to a body, Rom. vi. 6, or to a *man*, in the same place; therefore it was just and proper, this same metaphor being retained, to call the parts of this corruption *members.* Every one of us possesses three men, or three bodies: the natural and visible body, the members of which are also known and visible; the body of sin, or of the old Adam, the members of which are those vicious dispositions, desires, and actions which we just now glanced at: and the body of the new man; which is renewed after the image of God; the members of which are faith, love, holiness, and other gifts of the Holy Spirit.

2. The vicious affections and acts proceeding from this old Adam are perhaps called *members*, because they cleave to and exert themselves in each of the members and parts of this natural body. Therefore, by that figure of speech which they call *metonymy of the subject*, the term *members* is transferred to signify the vicious affections and acts which are in and from the bodily members.

3. They are called *members* from the proportion, or similar use which they have, if compared with the members of the natural body. For as we use the members of this natural body to fulfil the desires and perform the operations of nature; so the old man uses those vicious affections as instruments, for fulfilling the desires and performing the works of sin.

Ye perceive why they are called *members:* now let us look why *your* and *earthly* is added.

Your.] These members are called ours, because that whole body of sin is also properly ours. This natural body which we bear, is ours now as to its use; but we received

it from God as to its creation: Job x. 10, 11, *Hast thou not poured me out as milk, and curdled me like cheese? Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast fenced me with sinews.* But this body of sin, and every one of its members are in every respect ours: for *God made man upright:* man has rendered himself depraved and corrupt.

Earthly.] So he calls vicious desires, because they always tend to earthly things; because they hold the minds of men to earthly things; because corrupt habits and affections dwell only among earthly things, but are excluded from heavenly ones: Rev. xxi. 27, *There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that is defiled;* and xxii. 15, *Without are dogs,* &c. This general exhortation to mortify our earthly members being now explained, we deduce some corollaries.

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth,

1. He is not risen with Christ who does not labour to mortify the flesh: for from the virtue of the death and resurrection of Christ communicated to us, there always follows a desire of mortification and holiness: Therefore, as many as delight in the flesh, are not mortified, but are dead in sin.

2. A true desire of external mortification cannot exert itself in men corrupt by sin, unless they have within them the effective principle of internal mortification, the grace, I mean, of the Spirit of regeneration. Therefore, the external exercises which are sometimes wrought by the wicked, and bear the resemblance of mortification, are not the genuine effects of internal mortification, but false appearances.

From the act commanded; *Mortify ye,* we infer,

3. That the regenerate themselves never attain such perfect mortification in this life, but that they must always strive to mortify themselves more and more.

4. If they relax in this desire, that which happened to holy David may happen to every one, that he be carried away by the impetuosity of his lusts, and, for a time, may be a wretched slave to sin, over which he had before triumphed gloriously.

From the object; *members,*

5. This body of sin is as natural to every one of us, as is the very body of our flesh; nor does it consist of fewer members than that other.

6. As whilst we live here we necessarily carry about this natural body, nor are able to put it off; so neither can we entirely lay aside this body of sin, which cleaves to us, although we can and ought to chasten and subdue it. There is, therefore, a perpetual, laborious, and dangerous warfare to the Christian: perpetual, because with an enemy not to be extirpated in this life; laborious, because with a manifold enemy; dangerous, because with an internal enemy.

7. Original sin is not to be placed in a mere privation or withdrawal of original righteousness, as certain of the Schoolmen dream; but, furthermore, in many depraved and corrupted dispositions, habits, and affections. Parisiensis hath learnedly proved this opinion in lib. De vitiis et peccatis, cap. 5 and 6. Thomas, 1. 2. qu. 82. art. 1, assents to this, whose words I shall annex: *We must assert, that as bodily sickness partly consists in privation, as far as the equality of health is taken away; and partly in positive infliction, the humours themselves being disordered: so also original sin consists in the privation of original righteousness; and, together with this, in the disorder of the faculties of the soul: wherefore, it is not a mere privation, but a certain corrupt habit.* Thus speaks Thomas. Neither is it probable that these words which are used by the Apostle, *the old Adam, the body of sin, earthly members,* intend nothing else than mere privation.

From the epithets, *your,* and *earthly,*

8. Original sin hath its origin, neither from God our Creator, nor from the principles of our pure and upright nature, but from the voluntary sin of our first parents. Hence our members are called parts of it, i. e. of the old Adam, propagated to us, and dwelling in us.

9. If there be any thing good in us, that ought to be referred to God alone; for *What hast thou which thou hast not received?* If we would arrogate any thing to ourselves

which we might claim as peculiar to us, and our own, it is sin and corruption, not merit and righteousness.

10. The mind of sensual man lies wholly sunk in earthly things, neither is he able to raise himself heavenward before grace be infused: for the members of our soul, i. e. the inclinations and affections, are *of the earth*, earthly, or affixed to the earth *naturally;* and, indeed, are not raised towards heaven except by *grace* exciting them.

11. We must withstand all these earthly desires, because they are members of the old Adam, to obey whom is nothing else than to rush to destruction.—Thus much concerning the general exhortation.

Fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry.] The Apostle by a general exhortation had persuaded to a mortification of the earthly members of the old Adam: Now, that we may be certain what those members are, he adds a particular specification of certain of them, from the enumeration of which he would have all the others also, which are of the same nature and origin, to be understood, i. e. what are the effects of the old man. He begins, as you perceive, with carnal vices: to these he couples covetousness, which he then marks with a black brand, by comparing it to idolatry. As to the vices of carnal luxury, he seems to me to condemn, 1. The external actions; for to these I refer *fornication* and *uncleanness:* 2. The internal motions and affections, which that word παθος (rendered, *inordinate affection)* denotes: 3. The very root or fountain of external and internal lust, which he calls *evil concupiscence.* Let us run over these, each in its order.

Fornication.] Augustine, Exposit. Epist. ad Gal. tom. 4, defines fornication *indiscriminate concubinage, unrestrained by lawful wedlock, and sought only for the gratification of lust.* It is wont to be restricted to those who have commerce with prostitutes, or at least with concubines: for if they violate married females or virgins, the one is deemed *adultery,* the other *ravishment.* So familiar was this vice among the Heathen, as to be accounted by most among the lawful pleasures. That saying of the comedian is well known,

It is not a crime (believe me) to corrupt a boy. And lest any one should say this was spoken in the person of Mitio, he will find the same, according to Horace, to have been the opinion of the rigid Cato; who, when he observed a youth entering a brothel, said, *Hither it is right that young men should descend;* as though that were an argument of probity and honesty. This opinion had taken deep root in the minds of almost all the Heathen, that fornication was either lawful, or at least to be tolerated. This error, therefore, the Apostle in the first place meets, and asserts that fornication should be utterly repelled by Christians; for if this be proved, it easily follows, that other kinds of pleasure which incur heavier guilt are much more to be avoided.

As to this vice; 1. We shall shew from the Holy Scriptures how pernicious it is: 2. We shall overturn those excuses which are usually brought by the patrons of lust. It will be manifest that this is indeed a heavy sin, if it be weighed in the standard of the sanctuary.

1. Because it is always reckoned up, not among lawful pleasures, but among the most loathsome and detestable impurities. The Apostle, in Rom. i. 29, writes, that those who are delivered to a reprobate mind *are filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness,* &c. And in Ephes. v. 3, *Fornication and all uncleanness let it not be named among you,* &c.

2. Because they are judged to be excluded from the intercourse of faithful Christians who follow fornication: but no one is to be cast out of the Church for light errors. We have this broad sentence of Paul against fornication, 1 Cor. v. 9, 11, *I wrote unto you not to company with fornicators: if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, &c. with such an one no not to eat.*

3. Because for this crime men are excluded from the kingdom of heaven, and are subjected to the Divine wrath and indignation. 1 Cor. vi. 9, *Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, &c. shall inherit the kingdom of God.* And in Heb. xiii. 4, *Whoremongers and adulterers God shall judge.*

It is very easy to add many other reasons to these, which may also demonstrate the weight of this crime.

4. Because it more especially pollutes the body than other vices: but our bodies are *members of Christ and temples of the Holy Ghost*, 1 Cor. vi. 15, &c. It is, therefore, no light crime to make the members of Christ members of harlots, or to make the temple of the Holy Spirit an abode of lust.

5. Because it peculiarly blinds the mind and understanding. The wise Solomon, being blinded by this vice, proceeded to idolatries; *Women turned away his heart*, 1 Kings xi. 3. Neither, indeed, did this escape the philosopher. Eth. vii. 10, Ουχ αμα φρονιμον και ακρατη ενδεχεται ειναι τον αυτον; *Wisdom and incontinence in the same man are incompatible.* Gregory the Great, in Moral 33, says, that *blindness of the mind is the eldest daughter of luxury.*

6. Because not only does it constitute the fornicator himself guilty of eternal death, but those miserable beings also with whom he sins. This greatly augments the aggravation of this sin: for it is not so in other crimes. If a man steals the goods of a woman, if he bears false testimony against her, if, finally, he should kill her, he does her an injury; but he does not involve her in damnable guilt, because he does not make her a partaker of his sin: but the fornicators defile them with their sins; so that, although they themselves repent, yet they are of necessity tormented in mind, because as much as is in them they have precipitated other souls into hell by the contagion of their crime. Thus much as to the enormity of this sin.

Now let us hear, secondly, what is wont to be alleged by those who deny that simple fornication (for I would use their own words) is a mortal sin: and also by those who, when they have admitted that it is a mortal sin, yet contend that brothels and prostitutes must be retained. The former was not only an error of the heathen, but (if we believe Albertus*) of certain Christians: for he writes that the Greeks openly defended this, and that it was refuted

* Vide Vol. i. p. 148.

by the Latins in the Council of Lyons, Part. 2. tract 18, quæst. 122. Alfonsus de Castro* relates the same from Guido, lib. 7. tit. *Fornicatio.* The other is the error of the Papists, who stiffly maintain that brothels are not to be removed from cities: which is inferred as well from their writings, as from their practice (for they are not attempted to be done away).

1. They who deny that fornication is a mortal sin, thus argue from Acts xv. 20. The things there enumerated seem to be placed on one footing; but fornication is there enumerated with certain indifferent things: *They should abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.*

I answer, that fornication is not always reckoned in the Scripture with things in their nature indifferent, but sometimes with things simply evil, as we have shewn. And the reason why, in this place, it is enumerated with certain things indifferent, is not, because they are of the same nature, or of equal guilt; but because all these things equally prevailed to disturb the Church, and to excite dissention between the Gentile converts, and the Jews who were yet weak.

2. They object, that which is mortal sin, and morally evil in itself, is understood to be so by the light of nature; but the Heathen, who were averse to the more flagitious crimes, as adultery, rape, and incest, thought that fornication should be imputed to no one as a vice; viz. because nature did not point it out as a sin.

I answer, first, we must not decide *concerning things according to the opinion of the ungodly,* as we must not *about the taste of things according to the estimation of the sick,* as Aquinas has well remarked. Therefore, although a corrupt and blinded mind does not judge fornication to be sin, yet

* Alphonsus (Peter) a Spanish Jew of the twelfth Century, who became a convert to Christianity, and wrote, first, a "Dialogue between a Jew and a Christian;" and afterwards, a Treatise on "Science and Philosophy:" he was eminent for his knowledge of sacred and profane literature.

it is by no means on that account not to be regarded as a sin: for, by the confession of the Orator, Cic. De legib. 1, *so corrupting is the habit of evil that by it the small sparks issued from nature are extinguished, and contrary vices spring up.* But neither do we admit, that fornication was not condemned by the wiser Heathens. Alcmena in Plautus says, *With a woman whom thou judgest to be immodest thou wilt not converse, either in jest or in earnest, unless thou be the most foolish of all men.* Tacitus also observes, *There is nothing pure in a mind corrupted by lust.*

3. It is objected, Sin cannot come by a Divine command; but God commanded Hosea the prophet, *Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms, and make to thyself children of whoredoms,* &c. Cap. i. 11. It is not a sin, therefore, to commit fornication.

I answer, the word *fac, make,* which is added in the Vulgate version, is neither in the Hebrew, nor the Greek; but the prophet is commanded to take to himself for a wife that harlot, and bring home to his house even the children which were born to her in fornication. Whether this were a true fact, or was proposed in a figure only, to express the spiritual fornication of the Jews whom God had espoused to himself; it in no way helps those patrons of fornication. If we assert with Origen, Jerome, the Chaldæ paraphrast, Tremellius, and many others, that this was done in vision only, then it is altogether irrelevant to the point. If we admit with Irenæus, Basil, Augustine, Cyril, and others, that it was done in reality; yet it argues nothing in defence of fornication: for the prophet was not commanded to commit fornication, but to take to himself a wife formerly addicted to fornication. Hence says Augustine, versus Faustus, lib. 22, cap. 80, *What is there, I ask, inimical to the Christian faith, if a harlot, abandoning her fornication, becomes a chaste wife?* But that which follows in the Vulgate version, *and make to thyself children of fornication,* is not repugnant to this opinion, which supposes the prophet to have married this prostitute: for either those were called children of fornication whom she had had before, as appears from the original context; or, if it be referred to

those whom she was to conceive by the prophet, they also were called children of fornication; because following the example of their mother they would most likely become fornicators. Lastly, whichever of these be the fact, it may be answered, That God can specially command a thing which may be forbidden by the ordinary law: thus he commanded Abraham to slay his innocent son, and the Jews to carry away the goods of the Egyptians: Therefore, by the intervention of a special and extraordinary command, the obligation of an ordinary one ceases; because the condition of the case is changed.

4. They object, Fornication is not contrary to charity; therefore it is not a sin. For thus these points are argued by Augustine, Tom. 9, De decem chord. cap. 10, *When I go to a harlot, to whom do I do what I am unwilling to suffer? How do I violate that maxim, What you would not have done to you, you should not do to another? If I lust after my neighbour's wife, I am unwilling that any one should lust after mine. If I covet my neighbour's goods, I am unwilling that he should take away mine: I do therefore what I am unwilling to suffer. But when I go to an harlot, to whom do I do what I am unwilling to suffer?*

I reply, it is repugnant to charity even in the highest degree. 1. Inasmuch as it is repugnant to the good of the offspring that may be born, whose instruction and education is neglected, seeing that it is the conception of promiscuous concubinage. 2. Inasmuch as it is repugnant to the good of the woman who is corrupted, and to the good of the fornicator himself; whilst the body and mind in each is polluted, and a deadly guilt is incurred. 3. Inasmuch as it is repugnant to the Divine love; whilst the image of God is destroyed by this foul lust, and the command of God is violated. Neither does it help them to affirm that that rule, *What you wish not to be done to you, you should not do to another,* is not violated by fornication. For what a man would wish to be done to by others is not to be regarded simply: but what he would wish in a regulated and sound will. If a man should wish his own daughter to be defloured, it will not, therefore, be lawful

for him to deflour the daughter of another; because this is the wish of an evil and inordinate will.

Let us now come to the Papists, who concede that fornication is a mortal sin; but maintain, nevertheless, that brothels and public harlots should be allowed in cities, lest the inclination of lustful men should transgress against married females. *In human governments*, says Aquinas, Q. 2. qu. 10. art. 11, *they who preside, justly tolerate some evils, lest they should incur worse;* and he instances lewd women. This was the very plea of the heathen; for thus says Cato, *Young men ought to have recourse to harlots, lest they should approach the wives of others.* But Augustine also is called in to their aid, and that expression, *Take away harlots from human society, and you will disturb all things by lust,* is cited from his lib. 2. De ordin. cap. 4.

I answer,

1. The Papists favour fornication too clearly, when for the sake of avoiding adultery, they tolerate fornication, and to avoid fornication do not allow marriage. I speak of the Clergy and Monks, to whom the extraordinary gift of continence is not granted by God. For why do they tolerate fornication among the laity, which they say is a mortal sin, and not allow marriage among the clergy, which the Holy Spirit, Heb. xiii. 4, has pronounced to be *honourable in all;* unless that (whatever they contend to the contrary,) they do not cordially and sincerely determine it to be a deadly sin? Hence that observation, Dist. 82, in Gloss: *They declare that no one is now to be rejected for fornication, because our bodies are more frail than they were formerly.* And Caus. 2. qu. 7, in Gloss, *No one is at this day to be rejected for simple fornication.* It is clear, therefore, that the Papists are the manifest Patrons of fornication: nor is it to be wondered at if they so willingly abstain from wedlock.*

* In the Decretals of Gratian, which were upheld in credit by the Papacy, it is actually laid down on the alleged authority of a Council at Toledo, *Qui non habet uxorem, loco illius* CONCUBINAM DEBET HABERE. Dist. 39. Edit. Paris, 1512.

2. What they affirm, that brothels are to be tolerated lest married women should be violated, is contrary to the Divine command, Deut. xxiii. 17, *There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel*, &c. It is contrary to Apostolic doctrine; which would have matrimony, not fornication, to be the remedy for lust. It is contrary to the received opinion of Theologians, who deny that a compensation of sins is to be admitted: Harlots, therefore, are not to be prostituted lest married women should be violated. Lastly, it is contrary to the duty of the Christian magistrate; who is bound, as much as in him lies, to take care that all may live piously, soberly, and righteously: Rom. xiii. He ought not, therefore, to suffer those who openly profess whoredom.

3. With respect to the remark of Augustine, *Take away harlots from human society and you will disturb all things by lust;* we answer, it is not of much weight: because he wrote those books *De ordine*, when he was a young man, and not then baptized, as is evident from the first of his Retractations.* We also oppose to it the more serious of the Fathers. Lactantius, Instit. lib. 6, cap. 23, says, *The devil set up brothels, and published the shame of unhappy women.* Clemens, Pædag. 3. cap. 3, *Brothels are trophies of public intemperance.* Tertullian, de cultu fæminar. calls harlots *the most unhappy victims of public lusts.* But now how disgraceful to the Christian magistrate, if he defend the inventions of the devil, if he suffer that victims be publicly immolated to lust, if, in short, he do not demolish the trophies of intemperance. Besides, I say, that however diligently the magistrate may endeavour to repress fornication, yet he can never wholly remove from human society harlots or fornicators, no more than he can remove thieves or murderers. Therefore the Papists may dismiss this fear.

* The use of Augustine's opinion in this matter, at a time when he was no Christian, is quite in papistical keeping, as to the mode of sheltering themselves under autnority, or wresting the sentiments of the Fathers to their purpose. Of this many of thsir modern writers furnish eminent examples, as recent controversial works amply exhibit.

Lastly we must also add; that this remedy (the toleration of brothels*) is worse than even the disease which is dreaded. For although adultery be in itself worse than fornication; yet it is worse for a whole city to be continually polluted by brothels, than if it should sometimes happen that certain wedded women be violated. But even this is by no means to be conceded; that the honour and chastity of married women can be better preserved by the permission of fornication than by the severe punishment of it. For by impunity, and the continued habit of sinning we become more daring; and if we have served an apprenticeship to lust among harlots, becoming anon veterans, we the more confidently assault wedded females. This point acquires support from the fact, that we scarcely ever have either read or heard of married women having been defiled by any other than by those who were before accustomed to practices with harlots: so admirably does the toleration of brothels conduce to the protection of the chastity of married women!—And these remarks may suffice against those who either deny that fornication is to be accounted a sin, or say that it is to be tolerated for the sake of avoiding adultery. We have dwelt the longer in opposing fornication, because it has obtained its patrons. The other vices which remain we shall remark upon more briefly.

In the second place, then, ακαθαρσια, or *uncleanness*, follows: By which term the Apostle would comprehend all the more filthy kinds of lust, as adultery, incest, rape, and especially those sins of excess which even nature herself abhors. Therefore, they who not only wallow in one kind of lust, but in different kinds, and those the most foul, are called *the unclean*. This *uncleanness* prevailed among almost all the Gentiles; which you may easily gather from their poets, who often blame, although they sometimes approve these impurities, Rom. i. 27. Tertullian, in his book, De

* The horrid fact may not be generally known among Protestants that Public Stews, or houses of prostitution, are to this day officially licensed in Papal States, and that his Holiness derives a large portion of his revenue therefrom. Papal Rome is literally "the Mother of harlots!"

Pudicitia, speaks of this uncleanness: *Those impious furies of lusts,* says he, *contrary to nature itself, we remove not only from the threshold, but from the whole house of the Church; for they are not sins merely but portentous vermin.** Therefore, because the unrestrained appetite of the lustful is wont to proceed sometimes from fornication to this uncleanness; so, after fornication, the Apostle declares that all other uncleanness is also to be mortified.

Observe, 1. There is no sin so foul, so foreign from humanity itself, into which the inbred corruption of our nature may not impel a man not yet mortified.

2. Lesser sins pave and fence a path, as it were, to greater; this *uncleanness* always follows in the train of fornication: Hence says the Apostle, Ephes. v. 3, *But fornication and all uncleanness.*

3. To avoid greater sins, it is most safe not to tolerate the lesser, but as much as in us lies to root them out. If you resist vice at its birth there will be no growth to worse; but if in this you indulge ever so little, the iniquity increases.† Thus far we have contended against the external acts of lust.

Πάθος.] Some translate this *effeminacy,* others *lust.*‡ The Apostle teaches that after all the external acts of lust have been repressed, the internal motion itself, and the unbridled passion must be restrained. Πάθος, then denotes that disposition of the mind whereby any one is fitted and ready for the sin of lust, when any occasion is offered; and because this vice arises from the effeminacy of a mind unwilling to sustain the attack even of the least temptation, therefore some not improperly render Πάθος *effeminacy.* For they are justly deemed effeminate whose minds do not resist the temptations of the flesh; but willingly and immediately yield themselves to the bonds of lust, even as Samson yielded himself up to be bound by Dalilah.

* Alluding probably to the abundance of particular insects as an indication of impending judgments; as in the case of the plagues of Egypt.

† See Bishop Hopkins's most instructive and impressive Sermon on "*The great evil and danger of Little Sins.*"

‡ In our version it is translated *inordinate affection.*

The Apostle teaches that such a disposition of mind is to be mortified and abandoned by a Christian man; nor may any Christian whatever refuse to do it;

1. Because it is Heathenish to serve his own lusts; it is Christian to serve God and holiness. Whence says the Apostle, 1 Thess. iv. 3, &c. *This is the will of God, even your sanctification, that every one should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour, not in the lust of concupiscence, as the Gentiles which know not God.*

2. Not only is it Heathenish, but it is brutish, to labour under this disease. For it is the property of brutes to be actuated and governed by their passions; it is the part of a man to restrain them, and to reduce them within the sphere of reason. He, therefore, who is drawn aside by every appearance of pleasure presented to his mind or his sight, becomes *like to a horse or a mule, which hath no understanding.* Ps. xxxii. 9.

3. All holy and praiseworthy men have been accustomed to banish afar off this effeminacy of mind. The example of Joseph recorded in Genesis xxxix. stands pre-eminent, whom his mistress daily solicited with her enticements to lust, yet could not prevail. If he had laboured under this effeminacy, he would also have yielded immediately to gratify lust. But as Tertullian wisely says in his Apologet. *A pious and chaste man beholds a woman with safe eyes, because his mind is blind to lust.* Unless their minds are firmly set against the allurements of sin, and strengthened by Divine grace, men become the wildest slaves of lust, and resist not even its slightest temptations, but are led away as captives to every vice.

Evil concupiscence.] Now the Apostle endeavours to cut up the very root of wickedness. For *fornication and uncleanness,* as hath been said, denote evil acts; Πάθος, or *effeminacy,* that lustful and intemperate habit of mind, whereby men are so prepared, that straightway they seize every occasion of exercising lust, nor can restrain themselves; such as the Greeks call κυπρομανεῖς—(Venus-mad). But now *evil concupiscence* denotes the first motion of *inordinate desire;* which is called *evil* to distinguish it from

natural and spiritual concupiscence. For there is a threefold concupiscence: Natural; which comprehends the desiring power planted in the mind by God himself, and governing the ordinary motion of the same: vicious or carnal; which denotes the inordinateness and rebellious motion of this power: spiritual; which denotes a new and holy inclination of a reformed mind, of which concupiscence the Apostle speaks, Gal. v. 17, *The Spirit lusteth* or *desireth against the flesh.* Natural concupiscence, when it is carried to its due object and in a due manner, is to be gratified: spiritual, which tends to heavenly things, is to be nourished and cherished: carnal, which is likewise called evil, because it thirsts inordinately and after inordinate things, is to be mortified. Hence we may derive two lessons;

1. A Christian man ought to aim even at that perfection which he understands he cannot attain in this life. For no sinner hath ever been able to mortify and restrain all the first motions of inordinate concupiscence; yet all are bound to attempt it: for that Divine mandate stands immoveable, *Thou shalt not covet.* Concerning which, Augustine,* Epist. 200, ad Asellicum, truly said, *The law, in declaring thou shalt not covet, has laid down not the power which we have in this particular, but the object at which we should advance progressively.*

2. Those first motions of inordinate desires are sins, though the mind does not assent to them. Bellarmin, therefore, is wrong, who concludes, in De stat. pecc. 5. 7, that that rebellious motion of concupiscence has the nature, not of *guilt,* but of *punishment.* Why does the Apostle call it *evil?* Why does he say it is *to be mortified?* He is not wont to speak thus about punishments; which he teaches us are to be borne patiently, not to be mortified or resisted. Let the Jesuit hear Paul, who in Rom. vii. not once, but often, terms inordinate concupiscence *sin,* even in the regenerate who consent to the law, and oppose these motions. Let him also hear Augustine, lib. 5, contra

* After he became a Christian; see p. 45, Note.

Julian, cap. 3, *The lust of the flesh, against which the good Spirit lusteth, is sin, because we yield obedience contrary to the sway of reason.* Lastly, let him hear his own Schoolmen: Parisiensis says, *We ought to follow with the sword the petty thieves of first, second, and third motions, that is, the thoughts, desires, and delights which are beyond the control of reason,* De sacram. pœnit. cap. 15. *The whole host of the flesh which wars against the Spirit is sinful: therefore also all the battallions of that army: wherefore both the first battallion, which is that of the first motions; and the second, which is the delights beyond the control of reason, are sinful.* De sacram. matr. cap. 7. We have also Aquinas in concurrence with us, who is compelled to confess that the first motions in unbelievers are sins: whence it is manifest that they have the nature of sin, even in the faithful, although they have not the guilt, forasmuch as it is remitted in baptism. Lastly, we have Gerson also, Part. 2. in Reg. Moral. 6, *All the first motions which are suited to follow reason, and to be regulated by it, if they precede it may be called sins; because they deviate from the order of nature as it was first constituted.* Now let us proceed to those points which remain.

And covetousness which is idolatry.] Let us inquire, 1. What the Apostle would understand under the name *covetousness* or πλεονεξιας. 2. Why it is coupled with these carnal vices. 3. In what sense it is termed *idolatry.*

1. It is the insatiable appetite of the mind seeking riches, and confiding in them as in its chief good. That this insatiable thirst is the property of covetousness is shewn in Eccles. v. 10, *He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase.* Now that the rich are wont to confide in their riches, and to rest in them as their chief good, we see in the parable of the rich man, which is contained in Luke xii. 19, *I will say unto my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, eat, drink, and be merry.* The vice of *covetousness* πλεονεξιας is not the simple desire or seeking for temporal goods; but the doing it with an insatiable desire, by unlawful modes, and with a heart acquiescing and confiding in them. For temporal goods may be coveted in three

methods; for the necessity of life; for discharging the duties of benevolence; for enjoyment, or making them the end. This last is that vice of πλεονεξίας, to be avoided and mortified.

2. It may be enquired, Why he annexes *covetousness* to these carnal vices; for it seems rather to be reckoned among those that are spiritual. But the Apostle wisely inserts covetousness among them; and that on these accounts:

1. Because it is of a middle kind, between carnal and spiritual sins. Those vices are properly designated carnal, which have a sensible delight in a sensible object; as we see in the sins of gluttony and luxury: Those are as properly designated spiritual, which seek spiritual delight amid spiritual objects; as pride about personal excellence. Now covetousness occupies a middle place: it is carnal in respect of the object, because it seeks delight in external and corporeal things; it is spiritual in respect of the delight itself; because a covetous man hath delight only in this, that he possesses riches.

2. Because it affords incentives, causes, and occasions to both, namely, to carnal and spiritual vices. Hence spring the greatest incentives and excitements to luxury, to pride, to anger, and envy. Take away covetousness, and you will eradicate the greatest part of vices; for *it is the root of all evil,* 1 Tim. vi. 10.

3. Now, in the last place, we must see in what way it is called *idolatry.* Let Aquinas answer, *Not in kind; because a covetous man does not intend in regard to his money to account it as a God; but in similitude; because he pays to it supreme obedience.* So Ales; *A covetous man is called an idolater, because as an idolater behaves to an idol, so in a similar manner does a covetous man to his money.* Chrysostom, in Hom. 65, in xi. Joan, expatiates thus on this comparison, *As an idolater looks to, and regards with veneration, his idol: so a covetous man the riches he has heaped together: nor dares to touch them. As the one heaps together his idols in a certain corner, and shuts them up in closets and with bolts; so the other does to his money. In short, the former worships the*

idol; the latter, the gold; this immolates oxen and sheep to his idols; that gives up his mind and affections to covetousness. Such and many more like remarks hath Chrysostom. But it may still more perspicuously be said, That a covetous man is an idolater, because he loves his riches above all things; because he trusts in them more than all things; because he serves his riches more than he does God himself.

1. Because he loves them above all things: for as Clemens has rightly observed, Pædag. Q. 12, *Heaven is open, and he seeks not God; gold is hidden, and he ransacks the bowels of the earth for it.* Whence does this arise, unless because he had rather enjoy riches than God? Therefore, he commits spiritual idolatry with the riches of the world, *not,* as Gregory somewhere observes, *by the exhibition of ceremonies, but by the oblation of concupiscence.* For to whatever the affections of the heart cling as the chief good, that is taken into the place of God.

2. Because also he places that trust in riches which is due to God alone. For, in his heart he says *to gold* (what Job, xxxi. 24, loathes) *thou art my hope; and to the fine gold thou art my confidence.* Now that in which we hope, we make our God. Therefore, the voice of all the godly is, *In the Lord have I hoped; I have made God my helper.* But the covetous man has money alone as the sponsor or surety ἐγγυητην of his felicity.

3. Because he altogether neglects the service due to God, and gives his whole service to the scraping together of money. *Ye cannot serve God and Mammon,* Matt. vi. 24. And, therefore, as the god of the gluttonous is their belly, because their belly is perpetually served; so the god of avaricious men is money, because they serve money day and night.

Corollaries.

1. Nothing is more miserable or more foolish than a covetous man; because he forsakes God, and confides in clay. But *their silver and their gold shall not be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath,* Zeph. i. 18. Therefore we ought to trust, *not in uncertain riches, but in the liv-*

ing God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy, 1 Tim. vi. 17.

2. Nothing also is more base and flagitious than a covetous man; because as much as in him lies, he thrusts God from the throne of his Majesty, and sets up money in his place.

3. This vice is to be avoided before all others: because (to use the language of the Schools) it is most *adhesive to the creature,* and most *aversive from God;* but all the disgrace and defilement of sin consists in turning to the creature and departing from God.

4. Scarcely any one is wholly free from this idolatry; for we all cleave unduly to the creature, and thus incur some stain of idolatry. But we must withdraw the mind from them, and return to the love and service of God.

And thus much concerning the dissuasion itself from the vices above-named. The confirmation thereof follows in the two succeeding verses.

Verses 6, 7.

For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them.

The Apostle confirms the afore-mentioned dissuasive by two arguments. The first is drawn from the destructive consequence; for those sins enumerated provoke the Divine wrath; ver. 6. The second is derived from the removal of the cause; for in the regenerate inbred sin formerly lived: now it is dead, ver. 7. In the former argument three things are to be noted: 1. The cause of the event; *For which things' sake.* 2. The event itself, viz. the outpouring of the Divine wrath; *the wrath of God cometh.* 3.

The quality of the persons subjected to this Divine wrath: *the children of disobedience,* ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας.

1. *For which things' sake*] namely, for *fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness,* the wrath of God falleth upon sinners. These words are not to be taken in such sense, that we should conclude it is peculiar to these sins alone to excite the Divine wrath (for this meets all sins); but because upon those gross flagitious crimes, which especially overthrow human happiness, God is especially provoked to exercise vengeance. And on this account, the chief argument is: These sins are the occasion of heavier punishments; therefore, from them we must abstain with all care, for *it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,* Heb. x. 31. The Apostle wished to point out distinctly the cause of human misery, and of the Divine judgments, for two reasons,

1. That God might be cleared from all suspicion of cruelty or injustice, and might be acknowledged by all most merciful and just. For God is *the Father of mercies,* and not willing to overwhelm the human race with such calamities: but as the Poet formerly sang:

At heaven itself we aim through folly;
And such our crimes e'en God we suffer not,
To lay aside his vengeful bolts.

Hor. lib. 1. od. 3.

Therefore our wickednesses provoke the Divine wrath against us.

2. To throw a restraint upon the wicked: For, as saith Cyprian, *it affords great power to the wicked when he can deliberately rush forward with impunity.* On the other hand, It hath great power in restraining sin, when he understands it to be the sure cause of future misery. This the Apostle intimates in these words, *For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh,* &c.

The wrath of God.] We pass from the cause to the effect. The Fathers with almost unanimous consent explain *the wrath of God* to be the Divine punishment or vengeance. For it is not fit to assign troubled affections to God; since, as Augustine hath truly said, in Evang. Joan,

The anger of God is not the perturbation of an excited mind, but the tranquil constitution of righteous judgment. And in Enchirid ad Laurent. cap. 33, *When God is said to be angry, perturbation is not signified, like what is in the mind of an angry man; but his vengeance takes the name of anger from human motions.* Ambrose in Psalm xxxvii. *God does not lie open to passion, so that he should be angry; since he is without passions; but because he avenges he seems to be angry. This seems so to us, because we are accustomed to avenge ourselves with commotion.* The Schoolmen speak the same, but more compendiously: Anger is attributed to God, not according to *the passion of inquietude,* but according to *the effect of vengeance.* From this common opinion of theologians, Tertullian in 1 contra Marcion, and Lactantius in lib. De ira Dei, cap. 5, and 16, seem to differ: whose opinion is either to be softened down by a suitable interpretation, or rejected.

We may therefore assume, that by *the wrath of God* vengeance is to be understood, or the punishment imposed upon sinners; and it will be easy to shew that this wrath of God is joined and connected with sin, and especially the sins of luxury. In Gen. vi. 11, we read, *The earth was corrupt and filled with violence.* Here is the sin! But directly it follows, ver. 17, *I will bring a flood of waters upon the earth and destroy all flesh.* Behold the wrath or vengeance! So in Gen. xviii. 20, *The cry of Sodom and Gomorrha is great, and their sin is very grievous.* Here you have the sin. Gen. xix. 24, *Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire.* Here you have the vengeance. It would be tedious to go through all the examples of sacred Scripture. Let that in Job xxxi. 3, suffice: *Is not destruction to the wicked, and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?* as though he had said, It is certain, and placed beyond doubt, that God is estranged from sinners, and provoked to destroy them.

*Seldom hath punishment, though halting in its pace, failed to overtake the wicked striving to keep head of it.** Nay, it

* Horace, lib. iii. od. 2.

never fails, unless the sinner repent, and forsake his wickedness.

2. If we now inquire, Why the wrath of God is poured upon sinners, the reasons are at hand.

The first is derived from the Divine justice. For although God is not pleased with the sins of men, yet he is pleased with his own righteousness, according to which, punishment is due to sinners. Therefore, it is not evil in God to punish the wicked, because it proceeds from the love of righteousness; but the evil is in man, to deserve punishment; because it proceeds from the love of wickedness.

The second is derived from human advantage. For this is the particular end of punishments, that they may effect the amendment of sinners. *Whatever the Divinity may avenge before the last judgment, is not for the destruction of men, but is to be believed as intended for their recovery,* Augustine, contra epist. Man. cap. 1. Nor is it any objection to this argument that unbelievers are not so much admonished by these punishments to conversion, as blinded to condemnation, because this does not prevent them from sowing the seeds of a good harvest among the godly; for, as Cyprian, De zelo, remarks, *the punishments of the imprudent convey health to the prudent.*

The third is derived from the settled Providence of God: For God is the author of order throughout the universe, nor suffers any disorder to exist. But yet sin by its very nature is nothing else than mere disorder. As Aquinas has truly observed, Quæst. disp. De pecc. orig. art. 8, *Every sin is restored to order by means of punishment, in that it reduces its inequality to a certain quality.* And again, Quæst. disp. De pecc. venial, art. 10, *For it is just and determined that he who wishes to seek the pleasure of sin against the Divine will, shall be compelled to experience the bitterness of punishment against his own will.* John Gerson has spoken well concerning this matter, Part. 3, *Whatever thing deviates from one Divine constitution is driven into another; so that which deviates from the constitution of mercy, rests in that of justice: where no less in conformity with this constitution are*

the condemned fixed in hell than the blessed in heaven.—So far concerning the cause of the Divine wrath, and the outpouring of the same.

Upon the children of disobedience.] The quality of the persons subjected to this Divine wrath, is described in these words. In the Greek it is ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας. Some translate these words, *upon the children of distrust*, or *incredulity*; others, *upon the intractable*, or *disobedient children*. All these come to the same point; and denote men of that kind who can by no means be persuaded to believe the Divine word, and renounce their sins. In this term ἀπειθείας, therefore, two crimes are involved; one of *unbelief*, the other of *disobedience*; this latter is the genuine offspring of the former. Such were those who lived before the flood in the days of Noah; whom Peter, 1 Epis. iii. 20, calls *the incredulous*;* who, as Christ says, did in security, *eat, drink, marry, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away*, Matt. xxiv. 38, 39. Such were the people of Sodom and Gomorrha, who would not believe at the preaching of Lot, but, as though he spake in mockery, slighted him, Gen. xix. 14. Finally, such are all the reprobate, to whom that saying of the prophet Zechariah vii. 11, well applies, *But they refused to hearken, and pulled away the shoulder, and stopped their ears, that they should not hear.* It is plain, therefore, that the reprobate and blinded are described in this place: For although the elect may be disobedient for a time, yet they are not *the children of disobedience upon whom the wrath of God cometh*; because, being softened by the effectual operation of Divine grace, they at length yield; as we may perceive in all the examples of the godly who have fallen.

But here it may be doubted, what the Apostle meant, when he said, *for these sins*, viz. *fornication, uncleanness*, &c. *the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience.* Does it not also come upon the children of God? Who is ignorant that David felt the arrows of Divine wrath for

* *Incredulous* in the Vulgate; *disobedient* in our version, more consistently with the original.

his adultery with the wife of Uriah? and that other saints have been grievously punished for other crimes of theirs?

I answer, It is not to be denied that even the children of God, when they give the reins to the flesh, and yield themselves to sin of this sort, feel the wrath of God falling upon them: but it does not lie perpetually upon them; because they do not continue in these sins. Yet we must distinguish concerning the wrath of God: for God sends his wrath upon his fallen children, but paternally and for chastisement; and upon disobedient children as an enemy and to cut them off. Therefore, in these latter words the Apostle preferred to hold forth examples of the Divine wrath, that thus he might, indirectly as it were, instil the fear thereof into the pious. But we must add this also: When believers rush into sins of this kind against conscience, although that bond of the eternal good-will of God which depends upon election is not loosened; yet the love of friendship is loosened for a time, or at least the perception and enjoyment of it, which depend upon faith and sanctification. Therefore, whilst they are asleep in such sins, God acts towards them as with enemies; they are not able to apprehend God otherwise than angry and hostile towards them: they cannot, therefore, approach the throne of grace with confidence, but, like Adam, they flee from God, and throw themselves into hiding-places. There is need, therefore, of stirring up their faith and love; there is need of serious repentance, to avert the wrath of God, and obtain the favour and the smile of his countenance: For that declaration of St. Paul is true, Rom. ii. 9, &c. *Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil: but glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good. For there is no respect of persons with God.*

From these things we may draw the following instructions.

1. Under public calamities and miseries, we must not murmur against God; but impute whatever evils we suffer to our sins.

2. As often as we are solicited to sin, we should oppose to its allurements the consideration of the Divine wrath, which closely follows sinners.

3. Nothing is more to be desired by a Christian, than that he may retain the Divine favour; nothing is more to be dreaded than that he should provoke the wrath of God.

4. God is not so much provoked to vengeance by sin itself, as by the obstinacy of the unbelieving and impenitent sinner.

5. However the children of unbelief flatter themselves, they cannot avoid the Divine wrath; for *wrath* now *cometh upon them*, and *in coming it will come, and not tarry*.

6. Not only will the Divine wrath be poured forth upon the wicked, but upon the children of God themselves, if, quenching the grace of the Spirit, they indulge the lusts of the flesh. Therefore, the study of mortification is incumbent upon all who dread the wrath of God as they ought.

Vers. 7. *In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them.*

The Apostle is still occupied in confirming the foregoing dissuasive; and he shews the Colossians by a new argument that they must abstain from fornication, and so from all impurity of life. Now this argument is drawn from the removal of the cause to the removal of the effect; and the argument of the Apostle is thus applied: Sin is but the living and reigning cause of a wicked and lustful life: but sin is not living in you, but mortified: the cause, therefore, having ceased, the effect ceases. The Major is supposed: the Minor is shewn, in this verse, by a contrast of their former state. There had been a time, indeed, when ye lived in those sins, namely, before your conversion; but now it is passed, and ye do not live in them, but ye are dead to sin by baptism. It is usual among authors, when they say concerning any one, *That he has lived*, to intimate, He is dead, or he no longer lives: So the Apostle,

in saying *when ye lived in them, ye then walked in sins,* would intimate, Ye now live no longer in them; therefore, ye ought not to walk any longer in them. Thus ye have the force of the argument. Now let us consider the words.

In the which.] Erasmus renders it, *among whom,* and refers it to *the children of disobedience:* but Beza better, *in which,* viz. the aforesaid vices, *for which the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.*

Ye also walked.] They are said to *walk in sins,* who constantly commit sin, who resist not concupiscence, but obey it with pleasure; Ephes. ii. 2, 3. Therefore, as men are accustomed to walk here and there in transacting their daily business; so are those occupied in sins as in their ordinary vocation, and as though they had nothing else to do.

When ye lived in them.] i. e. When the cause of those sins, viz. the old Adam, or inbred corruption, lived and reigned in you; which corruption is now weakened and mortified. *To walk* and *to live,* then, whether the expressions are referred to the flesh or to the spirit, differ in the same manner as *power* and *operation* among philosophers: For life precedes, and operations suitable to life follow; as in Gal. v. 25, *If we live in the Spirit, let us walk in the Spirit:* so they who live in sin, walk in sin.

The sense of the words being now explained, two things which belong to the matter, are to be weighed: 1. The former state of the Colossians living in sin; which is expressed. 2. The new state of the same persons now dead to sin; which is implied by the contrast.

From the consideration of their former state, these instructions arise.

1. Nothing is more unhappy than unrenewed men. For to walk in sin with pleasure, is to hasten towards hell with pleasure: *The wages of sin is death,* Rom. vi. 23.

2. The fruits of a man in a corrupt state, are not works *preparatory to grace,* or, *deserving life eternal, of congruity,* as the Schoolmen say; but they are *preparatory to hell,* and *meritorious of eternal death, from condignity:* for he walks

in most gross and grievous sins, not in the paths of God's commands.

3. They who *appear* to walk in virtue, dazzle the eyes of men by outward and pretended shew only; whilst they really walk in sins, in which they live: for their deeds correspond to the powers whence they derive their origin.

4. The Papists, therefore, err, who ascribe to these works of carnal and unbelieving men, not only the praise of true virtue, but the efficacy of qualifying for the reception of grace; Durandus, lib. 4. dist. 15. qu. 3. Prosper speaks otherwise; *No true virtues dwell in the minds of the ungodly:* and Lactantius, lib. 6. cap. 9, *There is no doubt but every ungodly man knows not God: and that all his virtues which he thinks that he has or holds, are found in that way of death which is full of darkness.*

Now as to that new state of the converted and regenerate, among whom the Gospel intimates that the Colossians were now placed, these things are to be observed,

1. It is not unuseful for the renewed themselves, to call to mind their former state under sin: the Apostle mentions that they formerly walked and lived in sin, who were now dead to sin; not for the sake of upbraiding, but of encouraging them.

2. Christians that are now believers, ought not to take it amiss, when ministers bring before their eyes what they were under a state of sin in unbelief: for this is the Apostle's custom in almost all his Epistles. *Ye have yielded your members servants to iniquity unto iniquity,* &c. Rom. vi. 19. *Neither thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards,* &c. *shall inherit the kingdom of God: And such were some of you: but ye are washed,* &c. 1 Cor. vi. 10, 11. But most manifestly, Ephes. ii. 11—13, *Remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, having no hope. But now in Christ Jesus,* &c. Tertullian, De Pudicit. hath well observed to this point: *I am not ashamed of the error from which I am now free; because I feel that I am become better.* No one need be ashamed to improve.

3. The regenerate receive a twofold advantage from a

notice of this kind. 1. They are thereby excited to gratitude: for they must needs acknowledge that they are changed not by the power of free-will, but by the efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit. Hence the prophet; *Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned.* And Jerem. xiii. 23, *If the Ethiopian can change his skin, or the leopard his spots; then may ye also do good, who are accustomed to do evil.* Hence, then, as I have said, the regenerate are excited to thankfulness to God. *God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.* Rom. vi. 17. And Paul speaking of himself says, 1 Tim. i. 12, 13, *I thank my Lord, who hath enabled me, who was before a blasphemer and persecutor,* &c. Why does he, a true penitent and believer, thank God? Because not only is the mercy of God necessary when we repent; but also that we may repent.

2. They are excited to newness of life; for a new life requires new habits. Since, then, from the comparison and contrast, they find that they are now other persons than what they were heretofore, they understand at the same time, that of necessity it behoves them to live in another manner. For the Christian Religion not only calls men to believe new doctrines, but to perform new works. Whence says Cyprian, De Zelo, *To put on the name of Christ, and not to walk by the way of Christ, what else is it but to prevaricate with this Divine name?* This is constantly inculcated upon the regenerate; as in Rom. xiii. 12, *The night is far spent; the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light:* and Ephes. v. 8, *Ye were sometime darkness; but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.*

4. Here we have the difference between the regenerate and the unregenerate: The regenerate may fall into sin, but they do not habitually walk, neither can they live, in sin: for those walk in sin, who freely, constantly, and with full consent sin: he falls into sin, who rarely, through fear, and with wrestling is drawn aside into any crime or *devouring sin,* as Tertullian calls it. Therefore, they are

much deceived in their opinion, who think that they are faithful and regenerate, when that cannot be said concerning them which is here said of the Colossians, *In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them;* but, Ye still walk in them, and live in them.

And thus much of the two reasons whereby he confirms his dissuasive from the sins enumerated in the fifth verse.

Vers. 8, 9, 10, 11.

But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.
Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;
And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:
Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.

After a dissuasion from carnal vices in which special pleasure is sought, the Apostle dissuades also from spiritual ones, in which the injury of one's neighbour is attempted. In this last part of his dissuasions the Apostle does three things, which he includes in these four verses. 1. He lays down and enumerates the vices to be abandoned; which are those either of the heart; as *anger, wrath, malice;* or those of the mouth; as *evil speaking, filthy communication, lying.* 2. He subjoins a reason why vices of this kind should be abandoned by the Colossians, and that a twofold one: namely, because *they had put off the old man, and put on the new.* 3. He amplifies and strengthens these reasons in verse 11 by setting aside those false causes with which some men conceived that we are either benefitted or injured before God; these he rejects as things of

uo avail, in order to shew that human salvation entirely depends on the Spirit of Christ mortifying and quickening us; and that therefore we must aim at mortification before all other things.

As to what pertains to this eighth verse now under consideration, in it he effects two things. 1. After his dissuasion from carnal vices which render men infamous among all the sober and prudent, he dissuades also from all spiritual ones, which are deemed lighter faults, which are not accounted as vices among the generality. 2. He enumerates some expressly, that from these it may be understood that others of the same kind are to be condemned and abandoned.

1. *But now ye also put off all these.*] In this general persuasion we must first observe the circumstance of time denoted by the particle *now*. As if he had said, Ye were overwhelmed with spiritual vices as long as sin lived in you; but now, since it is mortified and hath ceased to live, ye ought and ye can put these things away: For God requires from Christians in a state of grace, another life and other manners than those to which they were heretofore accustomed in a state of sin. So the Apostle in many places declares. Thus Rom. xiii. 12, *The night is far spent; the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off*, &c. And 1 Thess. v. 5, 6, *Ye are the children of the day, and not of the night: let us not sleep as do others*, &c. Augustine, De vita Christiana, wisely remarks, *Let us not flatter ourselves with the name of Christians: but let us believe that this is the very reason we shall be judged, if we falsely claim to ourselves a name which doth not belong to us.* Cyprian also says, *We are Philosophers not in word, but in deed; neither do we talk great things but we live them.* Now, therefore, we especially must lay aside those vices, because we are Christians born again.

2. Secondly, We should well weigh that act to which the Colossians are exhorted by the word ἀπόθεσθε; which may be explained either to *put off*, as men put off their old and dirty clothes, or to *lay aside*, from the sight, from the affections, and from all the senses, as the corpses of the

dead shut up in sepulchres. And this last best agrees with the preceding word, *mortify:* as if he had said, Not only mortify your sins; but as though they were dead remove them from you, and put them away, and separate them from you altogether as dead bodies.

Now the instructions to be gathered are these:

1. Sin cleaves to the regenerate themselves, nor can it be entirely eradicated: yet we must still labour to put it off more and more every day.

2. We must not account sin a pleasure; but a thing to be hated by a Christian as deadly poison, or to be avoided as a putrid carcase. Now what it is to put away sin, by what power it is done, and how far it can be done by us in this life, we have explained in the exposition of the fifth verse, at these words, *Mortify therefore your members which are on the earth:* What is there said of the act of *mortifying*, may be applied to this act of *putting off.*

3. Thirdly, we should consider that this object of putting-off is of wide signification; as wide as the nature of sin itself: not this or that sin, but *all* sins are to be put off. For because some are enumerated just after, it is not by way of restriction to them, but by way of exemplification: for both those which are specially named, and all others besides (it is intimated) should be put off.

3. We are all prone by our nature and ready to run headlong into all sins. For original and inbred sin, although it is only one actually, yet is it virtually a whole army of vices; not unlike a seed, which is actually single, but virtually all those which are produced from it. Their corporeal constitution, and other external causes, make some men more inclined to certain vices; but there is no actual sin into which a man may not fall, in whom the nursery and fountain of all sin exists. We must, therefore, be on our guard against and avoid them all. So much of the general persuasion. Now let us come to the specification of the particular sins, in that order in which they are adduced; and first to those of the heart.

Anger, wrath, malice.] Anger in this place signifies an inordinate desire unjustly to injure one's neighbour for

some past offence. It is briefly defined by Damascenus, lib. 2, cap. 16, ὄρεξις τῆς ἀντιτιμωρησεως, *the appetite for revenge.* And in this unjust and vindictive desire of revenge (as the Schoolmen say) the *formal* of anger is contained. Θυμὸς, or *wrath*, denotes the hasty excitement of this passion, and that accession of blood around the heart, which the Schoolmen call the *material* of anger. Whence the same Damascenus says, in the passage before quoted; Θυμός εστι ζεσις τοῦ περὶ καρδίαν αἱματος ἐξ ἀναθυμίασεως τῆς χολῆς γινομένη. *Wrath is the boiling up of the blood around the heart, which arises from the kindling of resentment.* Κακία or *malice*, as some will have it, is a general vice, and denotes that vicious propensity which infects all the affections and desires, and inclines them to evil. Whence Bernard, in his Serm. 1, De pugn. spir. says, malice is *the taste for evil:* it is, then, the property of malice to make evil savoury and sweet; and, on the contrary, to render good insipid and unpleasant. But in this place I consider κακία to denote especially that machination of evil in the heart, which is wont to arise from anger in malevolent and incensed minds. We see all these in the example of Cain, Gen. iv. 5, Cain was very wroth and his countenance fell: thence he contrives the murder of Abel, when he says, *Let us go out:* This was the effect of his *malice.* From the same disease of *malice* proceeded those words of Esau, Gen. xxvii. 41, *The days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob.*

You will now see what and what kind of sins are here reproved by the Apostle. It follows that we should, in the second place, offer some reasons for which these sins of an angry mind are to be opposed and extirpated. Gregory, in Moral. 5, cap. 31, adduces many:

1. Because through anger the use of wisdom is lost, yea, reason itself is for the time extinguished. Hence, on that passage in Eccles. vii. 9, *Anger rests in the bosom of a fool,* Basil, in his Homily against anger, says, *Anger renders a man altogether ferocious, nor suffers him to remain any more a man.* The sentiment of the Poet, *Anger is a short madness,* is well known.

2. Because through anger, justice, the most illustrious of all the virtues, is violated: for whilst an exasperated mind sits in judgment, every thing which its fury may suggest it thinks right. Hence James, i. 20, *The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.* We have an example in the sons of Jacob, who, when inflamed with anger, perfidiously and cruelly slaughtered the Shechemites, Gen. xxxiv.; whence they merited that reproach of their dying father, *Cursed be their anger for it was fierce, and their wrath for it was cruel,* Gen. xlix. 7.

3. Because by anger the kindness of social life (which is peculiar to man) is lost. Hence Solomon, Prov. xxii. 24, says, *Make no friendship with an angry man; and with a furious man thou shalt not go:* As if he had said, these are entirely unfit for social life.

4. Because through anger the illumination of the Spirit is shut out. For the God of peace dwelleth not in a disturbed and wrathful heart, but in a mild and peaceful one. Chrysostom, in Hom. 30, ad pop. Antioch. says; *The Holy Spirit dwelleth not where rage inhabits.* Yea, he shews that such men are more like those possessed with devils, than men filled with the Holy Spirit: for as demoniacs froth and distort their countenances; so angry men have their minds foaming and distorted. See also Basil, De Ira.

5. Because through anger, which has an appetite for revenge, the remission of our sins is hindered, and the Divine wrath is provoked against us. Matt. xi. 26, *If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive you your trespasses.* Admirably speaks Tertullian, De orat. *How rash a thing is it either to pass a day without prayer, or to lose a prayer by continued anger?*

6. Because by being angry that which is the attribute of God is usurped with sacrilegious audacity. *Say not I will recompence evil; but wait for the Lord and he shall save thee,* Prov. xx. 22. *Vengeance is mine, and I will repay,* Deut. xxxii. 35. But an angry man (as is commonly said) makes himself the judge, and would have God to be the executioner: Yea, most commonly he would vindicate for

himself and by himself; a property which God hath reserved for himself alone.

Now in the last place it may be inquired, whether all anger is evil and unlawful, since the Apostle advises us to lay aside anger without any distinction. It is clear, that anger is not an affection evil in itself; both because God, who cannot be the author of evil, hath implanted in the human mind the faculty of anger; as especially because we read that Christ was moved with anger, Mark iii. 5. Hence Basil calls anger, *the very strength of the soul;* Damascenus, *the guardsman of the judgment.* Because Eli had not this anger, he stirred up against himself the Divine vengeance, as says Gregory, Moral 5, cap. 30. Hence the Apostle enjoins, *Be ye angry and sin not.* That is to say, Be ye angry where there is a fault with which ye ought to be angry; otherwise, as Ambrose rightly says, *it is not a virtue, but weakness and remissness.*

But that we may distinguish the natural and lawful affection from the inordinate and unlawful emotion of the same, we say that that anger is good which arises from a good motive, namely, from the love of God, or of our neighbour; and which tends to a good end, as the glory of God, and the correction of our neighbour; which proceeds according to a prescribed rule, awaiting or following for instance the determination of reason. Hither pertains that saying of Augustine, in De civit. Dei, lib. 9. cap. 5, *Under our discipline it is not so much inquired whether a pious mind may be angry, as wherefore he is angry: for no one of sound reflection would reprehend the being angry with a sinner that he may be corrected.* And Bernard, Epist. 69, says, *Not to be angry with what one ought to be angry, is to be unwilling to amend a sin: to be more angry than one ought to be, is to add sin to sin.* Lastly, Basil in his Homily De Ira, would have anger to be *a bridled horse, which obeys reason as a curb.* Such anger is not condemned.

On the other hand, it is clear that that anger is evil which arises from a bad beginning, or which tends to a bad end, or is exercised in an improper manner. If it should arise from a love of praise, or hatred of one's

neighbour; if it should tend to effect one's own revenge, or the injury of one's neighbour; if it should forestall the judgment of reason, or be borne headlong with a loose rein. For as Gregory in his Moral 5, cap. 33, well says, *The anger which impatience excites is one thing; the anger formed by a zeal for justice another.* We may hence conclude that we are not to cherish *apathy*,* but that tumultuous and inordinate passion is to be restrained. And thus much as to the sins of the heart: Certain sins of the mouth now follow.

Blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.] The Apostle aptly proceeds from vices of the heart to the sins of the mouth; because they arise from the inordinate affections of the heart.

And first he persuades us to lay aside *evil speaking:* in Greek βλασφημια; which word is derived from βλαπτειν την φημην, *injuring or disparaging the fame* of another by reproachful and evil words. This word in its primary and principal signification in the Holy Scriptures, imports a derogation or injury by words offered to the chief and greatest Good, that is, the good and great God. Now God is blasphemed in three ways: 1. When that which is repugnant to his nature is attributed to him; as if any one should say that God is corporeal, corruptible, subject to sinful passions; as the Poets formerly imagined and wrote. 2. When that which most befits him, is taken away; as if any one deny that he is good, merciful, omnipotent, &c. which blasphemy has its origin from the same ignorance. 3. When that which is the property of God is attributed to the creature; as if any one should say that the angels created this world, or that they are omnipotent; if any one say that mere† men can remit the sins of other men, can dispense with the penalties and punishments of the dead; or that they can by infallible judgment prescribe articles of faith to Christians. From the decree of God himself we find that capital punishment was assigned to this blas-

* This was the maxim of the Stoics.

† *Nudos homines*, men in their natural impotence and deformity.—Trans.

phemy, Levit. xxiv. 16, which we read in ver. 23, was inflicted on the blasphemer. But since in this place the Apostle seems to point out not that blasphemy whereby the Divine Majesty is assailed, but that whereby men are injured, dismissing this blasphemy of the Divine name, let us pass on to that other.

We say, then, that to this evil speaking which assaults one's neighbour, the epithet of blasphemy is also applied not only in this but in many places of Scripture. For instance, in Rom. iii. 8, *As we be slanderously reported,* &c. 1 Cor. iv. 13, *Being defamed, we entreat,* &c. Tit. iii. 2, *Put them in mind to speak evil of no man.** This blasphemy of one's neighbour arises from that anger and wrath of the heart which the Apostle has advised us above to lay aside. For *the heart by the bitter gall of malice, cannot through its instrument the tongue, scatter any thing but bitters,* as Bernard truly says. But it has no kind of vengeance so ready as this of evil-speaking.

This evil-speaking kind of blasphemy hath a double way of injury: one secret, called *detraction;* the other open, called *railing.* Rash and angry persons take the open course of injury; the crafty and malicious prefer the secret one. Let us consider how grievously both sin. And the grievousness of this sin is evident,

First, from the magnitude of the injury done to the neighbour who is evil spoken of: For they wound his reputation, which is a principal external blessing: nor is it easy to repair this injury by any just satisfaction; since here the quantity of loss cannot be estimated, which may be done in the taking away of other external matters.

Secondly, from the magnitude of the injury done to those who hear and take up those reports of evil speakers: For by these means, charity towards their neighbour is put an end to with them; hatreds, suspicions, contentions, and sometimes strifes are the consequence. Which inconvenience we read happened to Saul and David by the ef-

* The same word is used in the original Greek and in the Vulgate in each of these passages. viz. *blasphemę.*

forts of evil speakers and detractors. Hence that prayer of the Psalmist, cxx. 2, *Deliver my soul, O Lord, from lying lips, and from a deceitful tongue.*

Thirdly, from the magnitude of the injury done to God himself. For as God is praised in the saints when his works which he effects in them are praised; so when the saints are blasphemed and defamed by evil reports, God himself is blasphemed: for as a consequence, this blasphemy redounds against God who is the author of holiness: For *the servants being wounded an injury is done to their lord,* Justinianus, Instit. imp. lib. 4. cap. 4, De injuriis.

Fourthly, from the punishment due to evil speakers and detractors; and that according to civil, ecclesiastical, and divine laws. Justinian's pandects have this passage, lib. 4, cap. 4, De injuriis; *An injury is committed not only when any one shall have been struck with the fist or a stick; but likewise when he shall even have been reproached.* And the punishment is awarded according to the quality of the reproach, and also to the quality of the person affected by it. Gratian, Caus. 2. quæst. 1, has this passage, *If any one of the clergy shall have offered reproach or contumely to his bishop, let him be suspended.* And Caus. 6, quæst. 1, *Let the calumniators and revilers of their brethren be held infamous* (Cap. infames). As to the rule of Scripture; in Levit. xix. 16, there exists a law of the same kind, *Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer among thy people.* The punishment is assigned, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, *Neither thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners,* &c. *shall inherit the kingdom of God.*

We will now deduce some Corollaries from these considerations; and first, such as respect the blasphemers themselves.

1. The passion and habit of evil speaking argues an unregenerate man, and one still in a state of death and condemnation: for it is reckoned among the principal deeds of the *old man.*

2. Nothing is more unhappy than evil speakers and slanderers: for as Nazianzen elegantly says, *It is the extreme of misery to place one's comfort not in one's own happiness, but in the evils of others.*

3. Those who exercise this art are not disciples of the Apostle, but of the devil, and to him they give their assiduous labours: for he is called, Rev. xii. 10, *The accuser of the brethren.* Hence Parisiensis not unwisely calls evil speakers and slanderers, *the devil's dog-teeth,* De moribus, cap. 11.

We will now add other Corollaries which regard those who willingly lend an ear to these detractors.

1. If, therefore, evil speaking is so great a crime, then to hear evil speakers with delight cannot be void of sin. For not only they who commit the sin are worthy of punishment, but they also who applaud these sinners. *I cannot easily affirm which of these two is most censurable, to slander, or to listen to slander,* says Bernard, lib. 2, De consid. ad Eugenium; which is most true of *the hearing what is agreeable* (to use a Scholastic phrase). Each hath a devil; this in the ear; that in the tongue.

2. It behoves a pious man to turn away from and to reprove blasphemers and slanderers; nay, also to defend and to extricate his brother, when wounded by their detractions. We should withstand them; because, *as the north wind driveth away rain, so doth an angry countenance a backbiting tongue,* Prov. xxv. 23. We ought to succour a wounded brother also: *Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off,* says the Psalmist, ci. 5. *I brake also the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his teeth,* was among the consolations of Job, xxix. 17.

Respecting those injured and wounded by slander, the pious in this case have their consolation:

1. Because they may hence understand that the wicked break out into these attacks upon the good, not so much from their judgment, as from long-standing hereditary disease in their minds. They ought not, therefore, to grieve so much for their neighbour, as at the disease and madness of their slanderers.

2. Because slander harms not a good conscience. Neither does any one suffer prejudice from the opinion of those who have no judgment: nor, *if prejudice doth arise against them in this world, will it in the judgment of God,* as Ambrose well remarks, De interpret. lib. 2. cap. 3.

3. The opinion of good men, together with the testimony of the conscience, is sufficient for pious persons in this evil world, against the lip of those speaking lies; for as the Poet wisely sang,

False praise can charm, unreal shame control
Whom, but a vicious or a sickly soul?
Hor. Epist. lib. 1. Ep. 16.

4. Let not the godly ever be provoked by the example of evil speakers to speak evil again; but let them say with the Apostle, *Being reviled we bless: being persecuted we suffer it: being defamed we intreat,* 1 Cor. v. 12. *He cannot be moved by slander, who excludes the slandering of men by the gift of the Divine blessing,* Ambrose, Serm. 6, in Ps. cxviii. And the Psalmist says, cix. 28, *Let them curse, but bless thou.* Thus much concerning this first sin of the mouth.

Filthy communication] αισχρολογιαν, which the same Apostle calls *corrupt communication* λογον σαπρον, Ephes. ii. 29. And well does he call it *corrupt:* for it grows and buds forth from a corrupt root and also brings corruption, if I may so say, to the morals of men (for foul discourse is the daughter of luxury; since the libidinous, whose hearts are on fire with corrupt desires, easily break out into foul language). Hence says the Apostle, in those words cited from Menander, 1 Cor. xv. 33, *Evil communications corrupt good manners.*

This *filthy communication* is to be avoided by the Christian on many accounts,

1. Because it makes that which is most precious and peculiar to man, namely his faculty of speech, foul and ridiculous; *a gift not granted us for this purpose,* as it is well observed in Virgil, Æn. 4. 647. For obscene and scurrilous language is generally used for the purpose of raising a laugh. Against those who endeavour by obscene language *to excite the laughter of fools,* Clemens Alexandrinus gravely inveighs, Pædag. 2, cap. 5, *If no one,* says he, *would willingly assume a ridiculous bodily shape, why should we try to become ridiculous in words. Ridiculing the power of speech, the most honoured of all the possessions of man.*

2. Because it indicates and proves a corrupt mind. For

as bad fruit betrays a bad tree, so ridiculous and obscene words, a ridiculous and obscene mind. For as Clemens adds (ibid) *a man's discourse is the fruit of his mind.*

3. Because it is opposed to the sacred profession of a Christian. Hence says the Apostle, Ephes. v. 3, 4, *But fornication and all uncleanness or covetousness, let it not be once named among you as becometh saints. An evil word,* says Lactantius, *proceeds not from the mouth of him who cultivates chaste language.* This has reference to all Christians, but especially to those who are ministers of the word. *Thou hast consecrated thy mouth to the Gospel: it is unlawful to open it for such things; sacrilege to accustom it to them,* says Bernard. Whence that Canon of the Council of Carthage cited by Gratian, which runs, *We are of opinion that a minister who plays the buffoon and foul-mouthed jester should be stript of his office.* For *foolish sayings in the mouth of a Priest is blasphemy,* says Bernard, De consid. ad Eugen. lib. 2.

4. Because they corrupt both the speakers and the hearers. Clemens, Pædag. 2, cap. 6, truly and eloquently says, *that which is disorderly in words, will engender the practice of indecency also in deeds; but to be modest in what we say is to keep and preserve ourselves from lewdness.* Now as to what belongs to the hearers; we have Chrysostom's just remark, *As dust and mud make the ears of the flesh unclean, so does obscene and filthy communication the hearing of the mind.* We shall conclude with that saying of our Saviour, Matt. xii. 36, *But I say unto you, that for every idle word men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof at the day of judgment.* If, then, an idle word will receive the condemnation of a rigorous judge, how much more a foul or injurious one? *Think then how worthy of condemnation he is, who does not refrain from malice, when those words are punishable which merely are wanting in utility.* Thus reasons Gregory, Dial. lib. 3. Let us, then, put away from our mouths all malice and evil speaking, or filthy communication, as what defiles us with its foulness.

We may add to what hath been said,

1. Those who among their friends are accustomed to

use *filthy communication* as a kind of savour to their discourse, act like Commodus, who (according to Lampridius) for the sake of a joke, had human fæces mixed with the most exquisite dishes.

2. Pious men should not quietly submit to impure conversation; for as Athanasius says with truth, *a modest and pious man would bear to have stones thrown at him with greater patience than to hear obscene words.*

Vers. 9. *Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;*
10. *And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.*

We are now come to the last sin of the mouth, which the Apostle here persuades us to put off, namely, *lying:* which they are often found to be guilty of, who are most indignant when it is laid to their own charge; foolish and ridiculous people, who, while they allow themselves the liberty of sinning, would take from others that of blaming it. But let us come to the point, and inquire,

1. What lying is, and how many sorts of it there are.

I approve the definition of Augustine, De mendacio ad Consent. cap. 4. He says, *It is the voluntary setting forth of what is false, with the intention of deceiving.* To this Durandus (lib. 3. dist. 38. qu. 1) agrees, and the rest of the Schoolmen. Aquinas, Q. 2, qu. 110, art. 1, has this passage: *If the following three circumstances concur, that what is uttered be false, that it was wished to announce a falsehood; and, moreover, that it was the intention to deceive; then it has the qualities of a lie complete: for it is false both materially and formally.* So Ales, part 2. qu. 122. memb. 1, *The false meaning of a word is as the material in a lie: the completion, or formal property of it is the intention of deceiving.* The most received division of falsehoods is that taken

from their diverse objects: For one is called *pernicious;* another, *officious;* and another, *jocose.* The first is employed for the sake of injury; the second, for that of assistance; the third, for diversion.

2. We shall inquire if any of these be lawful, and without sin before God.

First, the Scripture itself denies it. Thus Revel. xxi. 8, *Fornicators, idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.* And, xxii. 15, *Without are dogs, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.* In Prov. xii. 22, *Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord.* Ephes. iv. 25, *Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour.* Secondly, Right reason denies it. For what is in itself evil in its nature, (ex genere) can by no means be good and lawful: but every falsehood is in itself evil, since it is an act grounded upon an unlawful matter. Thus Durandus says, lib. 3. dist. 38. qu. 1, *Language was instituted, not that men might deceive one another by it, but that they should use it to tell their mutual thoughts: it is therefore an unlawful act for one to utter words to signify that which he doth not intend in his mind.* Aquinas proves this by the same reasoning, Q. 2. qu. 110, art. 3, *Language,* says he, *is the natural sign of the understanding: it is therefore unnatural and unlawful that any one should signify that by his speech which does not exist in his mind.* Hence Aristotle (Eth. 4, cap. 7) concludes that all falsehood is wrong in itself, and to be avoided. Wherefore the most sound of the Fathers held all falsehood to be sin. Augustine, Enchirid. cap. 18, says, *Every falsehood is a sin, although he does not sin so greatly who lies with the desire of advising, as he does with that of injuring.* And again, in his treatise De mendacio ad Cons. cap. 21, *No one is to be brought to everlasting salvation by the aid of a lie.* Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 7, says, *A good man neither on his own account or his neighbour's will lie.* Gregory, Moral. 18, cap. 4, on Job xxvii. writes, *Every falsehood is sin: for whatever is discordant with truth, disagrees with equity. Neither is the life of any one to be defended by the fallacy of lying, lest he should injure his own soul who endeavours to give life to the*

flesh of another. The opinion of Cassian, which he gives in Collat. 17. cap. 17, is therefore to be disregarded, *that to ward off any great danger it is as lawful to use falsehood as hellebore.** And, cap. 25, he says, *that the Patriarchs had recourse to the protection of a lie in defence of life.*† Those

* This refers to the use of Hellebore among the antients, which was constantly exhibited by them to control the paroxysms and abate the symptoms of the more formidable and dangerous diseases, particularly madness.

† Cassian, to whom these two sentiments are attributed, was a Monk of the fifth Century, a native of Scythia, but educated in the Monastery of Bethlehem; who afterwards wandered through Egypt and Thebais with another Monk of the name of Germanus, for the sake of conferring with men of similar inclinations. He was at length ordained by Chrysostom, and settled at Marseilles, where he founded two Monasteries, one for men and another for virgins. He composed a code of Instructions for Monks, with the pieces above-mentioned, entitled "Collationes," or the subject of his conferences with others on the principles of Monachism, principally derived from the discipline and manners which prevailed among the Syrian and Egyptian Monks. He engaged in the controversy against Nestorius respecting the union of the two natures in Christ. The conclusion of his appeal to Nestorius as given by Du Pin, is remarkable. He says, adverting to the orthodox faith respecting the Person of Christ, "'Tis the faith "of this Creed which hath given you admittance to Baptism; 'tis by that "that you have been regenerated; 'tis by this faith that you have received "the Eucharist and the Lord's Supper. Lastly, I speak it with a sorrow, "'Tis that which hath raised you to the holy Ministry, to be a Deacon and "Priest, and made you capable of the Episcopal Dignity. What have "you done? Into what a sad condition have you cast yourself? By los-"ing the faith of the Creed you have lost all; the Sacraments of your "Priesthood and Episcopacy are grounded upon the truth of the Creed. "One of these two things you must do; either you must confess, That "he is God that is born of a Virgin, and so detest your error; or, if you "will not make such a Confession, you must renounce your Priesthood; "there is no middle way. If you have been orthodox, you are now an "apostate; and if you are at present orthodox, how can you be a Deacon, "Priest, or Bishop? Why were you so long in an error? Why did you "stay so long without contradicting others?" Thus we see how a denial of the supreme Divinity of the Lord that bought us was regarded in those days. On the doctrine of grace, however, and the strength of Free-will, as developed in his Collationes, Prosper considered Cassian himself greatly in error, and opposed his sentiments. It would seem, indeed, as Mosheim intimates, that in this respect he was a Semi-pelagian. His sentiments cited by our Expositor, would, moreover, certainly lead to such doctrines as have since been the disgrace of his Church, the occasion of many evils, and a hindrance to Religion in the world; and when we find them applaud-

who are of this opinion have not God, but Plato, for the author of such licentiousness: for he, in 3, De repub. says, *Falsehood is sometimes useful to men, as a medicine is: wherefore it is to be allowed to the public Physicians; but to be meddled with as little as possible by private people.* So much for Plato; who is, however, less indulgent to this sin of lying than Cassian. Jerome fastens this error upon Origen, lib. 1, Apolog. adv. Ruffin, where he writes, *the disciples of Origen are united among themselves by the insane mysteries of lies; Origenistas inter se orgiis mendaciorum fœderari.** But to all these errors we oppose those things which we have already adduced, and especially that admonition of the Apostle, Rom. iii. 8, *that we are not to do evil that good may come.*

3. Let us inquire whether parabolic and figurative expressions deserve the name of lying. For example, suppose one to say that a Heretic is a wolf; or should any one recite a parable, as that in Judges ix. 8, of the trees choosing to themselves a king, and many other such which occur in the Scriptures.

ed as they were by many subsequent heads of Orders, one cannot wonder at that Jesuitry—that sophistry and guile, which has since distinguished the Roman church, and is now clothing Romanism in a garb to suit modern sentiments and modern liberality.

* This great man, Origen, following as he did the principles of the Platonic philosophy, and imagining that the nature and extent of the reason of all doctrines of Religion might be found in it, and engaging a number of disciples, may be stated to have been the head of such speculative notions, and the mysticism they gave rise to. For from his disciples emanated in time the Philosophic or Scholastic theology, remarkable mostly for such absurdities. Vide Mosheim, under the notices of Origen.—As to what was just before remarked, as alleged in favour of the monstrosity so insidiously maintained, Cecil has well observed, that "the instances of *artifice* which "occur in Scripture are not to be imitated, but avoided: if Abraham, or "Isaac, or Jacob equivocate in order to obtain their ends, this is no war-"rant to me to do so: David's falsehood concerning Goliath's sword argued "distrust of God. If any part of the truth which I am bound to commu-"nicate be concealed, this is sinful artifice: the Jesuits in China, in order "to remove the offence of the Cross, declared that it was a falsehood in-"vented by the Jews that Christ was crucified; but they were expelled "from the empire: and this was designed, perhaps, to be held up as a "warning to all Missionaries, that no good end is to be carried by artifice." Vide Cecil's Remains, p. 341, 8vo. edition.

It is certain that neither the matter nor the form of lying can be found in these; and, therefore, they are wholly void of all taint of sin. The matter is not found; because falsehood is not uttered, but the truth expressed in a figurative and customary manner; for as the natural, so the metaphorical signification of words depends upon custom and the will of the speakers. Since, then, custom permits us to call a cruel man *a wolf* or *a lion*, or a base or foundation *a rock:* the proposition is the same, whether you say *a Heretic is a wolf*, or *a heretic is hostile and injurious to the flock of Christ:* that *the devil is a roaring lion;* or *the devil seeks souls for his prey: Christ is a rock;* or *Christ is the base or foundation of human salvation.* The same reasoning applies to parables: For, as Augustine justly remarks, De mend. ad Cons. cap. 5, *Every proposition is to be referred to that which it sets forth; but all that is figuratively said or done, sets forth that which it intimates to those by whom the proposition is to be understood.* Thus the Schoolmen. So Aquinas, quæst. disp. de prophetia, art. 10, *In metaphorical language the literal sense is attended to, and not what the metaphor expresses, but the meaning which is conveyed by the metaphor.* Durandus, lib. 3, dist. 38, says, *A figurative expression is not true or false according to the sense which it conveys, but to that which is intended.* So Gerson, part. 1, *In parables the literal sense is not that expressed by the words, but that pointed out by the things or the facts.* But neither is the *form* of lying found in these: for metaphors, parables, and apologues, are not used with the intention of deceiving, but with that of teaching with the greater elegance and pleasure. For he who asserts that *a heretic is a wolf*, or *the devil a roaring lion;* or he who puts forth a parable or apologue, does not intend to impose any thing false upon his hearers, but to represent more clearly something true, and useful to be known.

4. In the last place, Let us glance at that Jesuitical equivocation, which is defended, truly I know not whether more ridiculously or impiously, by those master-builders and patrons of lies. And first, we shall offer an example of Jesuitical equivocation, or (as they term it) mental re-

servation; then we shall convict them of manifest lying. Let us then assume that any Popish priest interrogated whether he be a priest or not, should answer expressly, nay, swear if it be necessary, that he is not a priest; he having reserved this thought in his mind, that he is not a priest of Apollo; or, that he is not such a priest as he desires to be; or, that he is not a priest bound to declare this to others: I ask whether he is guilty of a lie. That most lying Jesuit Parsons, in his Tract, ad mitigat. spect. &c. cap. 8, denies that he is. We affirm it, and we prove it from that definition of Augustine and the Schoolmen: For, *he voluntarily announces a falsehood, and that with the intention of deceiving.* There is the *material* of lying; for he denies that he is what he is: there is also the *form;* for by this denial he intends to impress a false opinion on the mind of his hearer. What has the Jesuit to reply to this?*

* The history of the man here referred to, and who figured principally in the time of Queen Elizabeth, is as extraordinary as the principles which he maintained to serve *the* Church, *at that time*, were horrible, and his conduct base and mischievous. His proper name appears to have been Robert Person. He was born in 1546, at Nether Stowey, in Somersetshire, where his father is said to have been a blacksmith. He however obtained an University education, having been a student at Baliol College, Oxford, where he took his degrees in arts, and obtained a Fellowship. According to Fuller, he was expelled from his post with disgrace, having been charged with embezzlement of the College money. He then went to Rome, and entered into the Order of the Jesuits, and in 1579, he returned to England as superior of the Catholic Missionaries. Two years afterwards, he was obliged to leave the kingdom hastily, in consequence of his political intrigues, when he again took refuge at Rome, where he was placed at the head of the English College. His political sagacity and active disposition induced Philip II. to employ him in some preliminary measures at the time of his projected invasion of England by the "*Invincible Armada;*" and, after the failure of that scheme, Parsons rendered himself formidable to the government of Queen Elizabeth by his attempts to promote insurrection, and procure the assassination of that Princess. He seems, however, to have carried on his plots with a degree of caution that argued a prudent regard for his own safety. From Camden's State Trials it appears that when Parsons came to England to head the party for pushing the treasonable practices determined on against the Queen, he at first so far proceeded without reserve to develope his schemes, that the Government was soon obliged to take active measures to counteract the proceedings of the iniquitous band; and to avoid seizure (as some even of the Papists meditated delivering him

He answers, first, *that the enunciation mentioned above is not false, because the enunciation or proposition, which is partly expressed and partly conceived in the mind, is one: but that is true, viz. I am not a priest of Apollo, or I am not a priest obliged to declare it.*

In reply; we allow this proposition, *I am not a priest obliged to declare that I am one,* is one: but we affirm that that other also which is expressed in words is an entire proposition, and distinct from this. Therefore, by this very point in which he defends himself, he is convicted of a lie; namely, that when he conceives the true proposition in his mind, he utters a falsehood: for although the true and false one may be in the view of the internal conception of the mind; yet the lie properly so called, regards the other, and the external declaration of the mind by the signs of words. However true, therefore, may be that which this priest has shut up in the conception of his mind, yet what he puts forth by the enunciation of a false proposition is a lie.

We may illustrate this by an example. Suppose any one being asked, Whether fire is hot, should assert and swear that fire is not hot, this distinction being reserved in his mind, that it is not hot by adventitious heat; or should any one say that man is not a rational animal, and then should defend himself on the ground that he is not a rational animal of the feathered or finny tribe; who would

into the Magistrates' hands for divulging the designs of deposing the Queen) Parsons lived under the several appellations of Walley, Darcy, Roberts, Farmer, and Phillips. Well might he contend for the principles combated by our Expositor. Thus, while Garnet and others of his fraternity became the victims of their zeal, he kept himself secure from danger, and died in 1610, at Rome, where he had for twenty-three years presided over the English College. Besides his Tract above-mentioned in defence of lying, he was the author of a "Conference about the Succession to the Crown of England," which he published under the name of Doleman, with a Dedication to the Earl of Essex; with other Tracts adapted to promote the unceasing designs of the Papal agents of his Order against Protestantism. He devoted one entire Pamphlet to the Defamation of the Earl of Leicester, an edition of which was published on the Continent, with a most mischievous and appalling title. Vide Sharon Turner's Modern History—Reign of Elizabeth, Notes.

not see that such an one is not free from the guilt of lying by these trifling reservations? For in a negative proposition, it is whatever is usually contained in the comprehension of the predicate that is removed from (i. e. denied of) the subject; not a single species only. So that he who dares to confirm propositions of this kind with an oath, relying upon his mental reservations, is guilty of perjury by the suffrages of all the antient theologians.

We only now adduce some few rules, leaving it to you to apply them to this dispute.

Rule 1. *By whatever artifice of words an oath is taken, God accepts it as he to whom the oath is made understands it.* Isidore.

2. *An oath is received according to the common usage of language.* Gerson, part. 2. But neither he to whom the oath is made, nor common usage, understands those clauses of reservation; and he who offers to make an oath knows this.

3. *No one ought to swear to any thing as certain,* says Durandus; *for an oath is calling God to witness for the confirmation of the truth of what the hearer doubts, and to which he will not assent on a simple assertion.* But there never was a doubt, whether that priest was the priest of Apollo: nor was it needful to profane an oath in proof of it.

4. *An oath consisting of many or equivocal words, binds in that sense which the words are wont to convey to persons rightly understanding them. If among such the words equally convey several significations, then the oath binds in that sense in which the swearer believed that he to whom the oath was made understood them at the time.* Altissiodorensis, lib. 3, tract. 19, qu. 4.

From all these instances we conclude, that notwithstanding the mental reservation, the material of a lie exists in that assertion of the priest, viz. his false proposition.

But, in the second place, the Jesuit answers, *The lie does not exist formally in this example: for he did not intend to deceive his hearer, but preserve himself from danger, in denying he was a priest, with the aforesaid mental reservation.*

But we reply, he intended both of these; for he would

preserve himself by deception, yet not likely to preserve himself unless he had first deceived his hearer by this jugglery. I conclude, therefore, with Ales, part. 2. qu. 122, mem. 1, *Although the ulterior intention be to benefit himself or his neighbour, nevertheless the immediate intention is to deceive; and as far as this is concerned a lie is told: for this last, the intention, in itself regards the language; but the former regards the will of the party, and not the words themselves.**

Seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds.] The Apostle here comes to the first argument of the aforesaid dissuasion. He derives it from the removal of the cause to the removal of the effects. For the old man is the cause of the vices before-mentioned; when he, therefore, is put off, they must be put off also.

The old man denotes the corruption inherent in our nature, the inclination of all our faculties to evil; and, moreover, that state of sinfulness which they acquired by the habit of sinning before their ingrafting into Christ. The

* The doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning Equivocations, mental Reservations, and the Lawfulness, or rather Obligation, of concealing, with the most solemn Oaths, what has been revealed under the seal of Confession, has perhaps some affinity with the doctrine of the Priscillianists, which overspread and disturbed Europe in the fifth Century—a sect which inculcated on their Proselytes the dreadful maxim, "*Swear, forswear, but never betray a secret*," and by which Cassian, as noticed at the outset of this topic, would seem to have been corrupted. The defence set up by the Romish divines for such a notion is, "That what is only known under the Seal of Confession, is not known to a man, but to God represented by a man, i. e. to the Priest or Confessor; and therefore the Priest may, with a safe Conscience, affirm, even upon oath, that he knows not what he thus knows. It is by recurring to this doctrine, that F. Daniel Bartoli, in his History of England, or rather of the *Jesuits* in England, endeavours to justify the conduct of the Jesuit Garnet, in not discovering the Gunpowder plot, to which he supposes him to have been privy. But as it was disclosed to him in confession, or at least under the seal of confession, he would have sinned grievously by discovering it, though by such a discovery he might have saved a whole nation from destruction. So that the violating such a Seal is a far greater evil than the loss of so many lives—than the utter ruin of an entire Nation:"—a doctrine evidently repugnant to the dictates both of reason and humanity, horrible in its own nature, and awfully dangerous in its consequences wherever it is held.—Vide Bower, Vol. i. p. 150.

deeds of this old man are those sins afore-mentioned, and others of the like kind extended to acts. He dissuades from these in other words, but in the same sense, in Ephes. iv. 22, *That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.*

He means that they *have put off* the old man sacramentally in undergoing baptism; efficaciously by the operation of the Spirit of regeneration; totally indeed as to the guilt and dominion of sin; inchoatively as to the nature and act or the motion of sin. But having spoken at length concerning this putting off of the old man, on the 12th verse of the preceding chapter, we will refer to that rather than inculcate the same things over again.

Vers. 10. *And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Where there is neither Greek,* &c.

Here is that other argument connected with the former one; for it cannot possibly happen that he who puts off the old man, should not at the same time put on the new. For as in physics, as soon as the old form (of existence) is expelled, a new one immediately succeeds: So when the old Adam is put off, a new man is at the same time put on: but when the new man is put on, the works and conversation of the old man must cease.

Here are three things to be observed: 1. What does the Apostle point out by this *new man,* whom he says the Colossians have put on. 2. How has the renovation taken place; by little and little, and continuously. 3. In what this renovation of the new man consists.

The new man.] As to this first, it may be explained in one word: for if the *old man* (as I have before shewn) designates the inherent corruption of our nature, with the proneness and inclination of all our faculties to do evil; then, by the law of contraries, *the new man* will designate

the renewing, and fresh propensity of all our faculties to do good, infused into and impressed upon the faithful by the power of the Holy Spirit. *I delight in the law of God after the inner man,* Rom. vii. 22. *That he would grant you to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man,* Ephes. iii. 16. The Holy Spirit, therefore, strengthens the renewed for those actions for which they before had neither the faculty nor inclination. Two Corollaries arise out of the consideration of this new man:

1. First, it excites to duty. It behoves those who have put on the new man, to adopt a new method of life. *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new:* 2 Cor. v. 17. He who assumes the character of a king, is both foolish and wicked if he acts the part of a buffoon; so is it with him who puts on the new man, if he shall act the part of the old.

2. Secondly, it depresses pride: for it behoves us to remember whence we obtained this newness, whatever it may be, and good works; namely, from the renewing Spirit. *In nothing then,* as says Cyprian, *should we boast, since nothing is ours. What hast thou which thou hast not received?* 1 Cor. iv. 7.

2. *Which is renewed.*] This word respects the manner, for it indicates the constant workings of the Holy Spirit in renewing us: as if he had said, This your renewing ceases not for one moment; for you have so put on the new man, that ye be more and more to be renewed daily: which is clearly taught in 2 Cor. iv. 16, *But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.*

Now the reason why there is need of this daily renewing is on account of the remains of indwelling sin; which the Divine wisdom has not seen fit to eradicate in a moment, but would rather leave it to the day of our dissolution, for the exercise of our virtue and the preservation of humility within us. As, therefore, in wine mingled with water, both wine and water are found in every part: so in the renewed man the conditions of regeneration and some corruptions of the old man are found mingled and wound up

together. Thus Augustine, de pecc. merit. et remiss. lib. 2. cap. 7 and 8, says, *Perfect newness does not exist in the mind itself of the regenerate:* and again, cap. 28, *The law of sin remains in the regenerate, although overcome and broken through.* On this account, therefore, the Apostle says this new man is still to be renewed in the sons of God.

Corollaries.

1. As the Spirit of God renews us more and more inwardly; so it behoves us, thus supported and aroused by the grace and help of the renewing spirit, to advance outwardly in holiness and good works: for *men,* says Augustine, de correp. et grat. cap. 2, *are led by the Spirit of God, that being acted upon they may act, not that they themselves should do nothing. Lest ye receive the grace of God in vain,* 2 Cor. vi. 1.

2. Those who deny that sin remains in the renewed, deny this daily benefit of the Holy Spirit renewing and remoulding us continually. For renewing intimates that something of the old man remains: for the old man is nothing else than *the body of sin,* as the Apostle elsewhere speaks. Thus much on the manner of the renewing; namely, that it is not effected in a moment, but by little and little.

3. Now, in the last place, we must consider in what things this renewing consists. The Apostle seems to place it in two particulars; the illumination of the mind, which he denotes by the word *knowledge,* and the healing and sanctification of the will, which he points out by the word *image.*

In knowledge.] As to the former, it is the property of the old man to have the mind darkened, as to what belongs to spiritual and saving knowledge. *Having the understanding darkened,* Ephes. iv. 8. *But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God,* 1 Cor. ii. 14. The Holy Spirit, therefore, when he leads us to a knowledge of spiritual things, begins this work of our renewal, by the infusion of life-giving knowledge and the light of faith. Hence that prayer of the Apostle for the Ephesians, i. 17, 18, *That the Father of glory may give unto you the Spirit of*

wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, &c. The Apostle uses the word *agnition* rather than *cognition,* lest any one should think he spoke of some idle and speculative knowledge; whereas the former word always means with him a lively, efficacious, and operative knowledge. This enlightening, then, of the understanding. and infusion of faith, and spiritual knowledge, is the first effect of a regenerating and renewing spirit. Whence Parisiensis very properly calls faith, *the first life of the human mind, and like spiritual light in the works of the re-creation: it is the gate of life through which God first enters the human mind;* de morib. cap. 1.

I will here remark, Those who require in Christians only a blind devotion, seem to wish to build up the edifice of holiness without a foundation, and to approve of Christians only half renewed.

After the image of him that created him.] After the light of knowledge and of faith is infused, the regenerating Spirit (who is the Creator of the new man) impresses the image of God upon the will. It is, therefore, another effect of regeneration, that when the mind is enlightened by faith, the human will should be conformed to God, and shew forth a Divine disposition in its love of holiness and righteousness. In this sense the Apostle, in Ephes. iv. 24, says, this new man is *after God created in righteousness and true holiness.* So 2 Pet. i. 3, 4, Christ is said to have given to the renewed *all things that pertain unto life and godliness;* and that these gifts have made us *partakers of the Divine nature,* and freed us *from the corruption which is in the world through lust.* By this image is denoted, therefore, a certain representation, as it were, of the Divine sanctity in the human mind. Concerning this image of God there are many disputations among the Fathers and Schoolmen.

First, they are wont to say, that the Son of God alone is the image of the Father; we are made according to this image, while irrational creatures have only the traces of the Divinity, not the image of God, not being made after this image. As to what pertains to this distinction between the eternal and natural Son of God, and we the

adopted sons, it is not accurately remarked in Scripture. For as he is called *the image of the Father,* Heb. i. 3; so we also are said to be not only made in the image, but *the image of God,* 1 Cor. xi. 7. We must, however, hold, that Christ is the image of God the Father in one way; we in another: He is the image by *equality,* having entirely the same nature with the Father of whom he is the image; every regenerated person is the image by *imitation,* partially representing a certain similitude to the Divine nature in some gifts of grace. Augustine illustrates this by no inapt simile: *As the image of an Emperor,* says he, *upon a coin differs from that in his son; so does the image of God in us differ from that in Christ.*

Secondly, the Schoolmen and Fathers inquire in what this image of God after which we are created, consists; and the consideration of this more nearly concerns our present purpose. Tertullian, in his treatise against Marcion, lib. 2, determines it in *immortality, freedom of will,* and *the capacity of knowledge.* Augustine, in 9 de Trin. cap. 4, assigns the image of God in the soul as consisting in these three things, *mind, understanding,* and *affections;** but in 1 de Trin. cap. 11, as *memory, intellect,* and *the will.*† The Schoolmen for the most part say, this image of God consists in *natural gifts;* but the likeness in *gifts of grace;* and the Gloss upon Genesis expresses this opinion, in saying that man was made *after the image of God,* as to *natural qualities:* after *his likeness,* as to *qualities of grace.* We allow, with the Fathers and Schoolmen, that a certain image of God is found in the natural faculties of the mind, which may be called the image *of the natural creation;* but nevertheless we affirm, both in this passage and every other of Paul, that *this* image of God (which may be called the image of *the supernatural re-creation)* is not placed in the powers, faculties, or qualities themselves of the native soul; but in the re-arrangement, sanctification, and confirmation of these according to the nature and will of God.

* *Mentem, notitiam, amorem.*

† *Memoriam, intelligentiam, voluntatem.*

To this Ambrose seems to me to have alluded in those words, Hexam. 6, cap. 8, *Thou art painted, O man, painted by the Lord thy God; thou hast a good artist, and painter; do not thou deface a good picture, shining not with varnish, but truth; not formed of wax, but of grace.* He, therefore, places the image of God which we bear in the effects of grace. Then we are renewed after the image of God when all the powers and inclinations of our souls are enlightened and sanctified.

We derive these Instructions:

1. The end of our regeneration is, that we may be made like to God, and, like a hard and polished mirror, reflect (as far as infirmity permits) his wisdom, righteousness, holiness, &c.

2. Those who do not seek after holiness and righteousness, still bear the image of the old Adam, nay, indeed, that of the devil; they are not yet renewed after the image of God, which chiefly consists in holiness: they must be adjudged to him whose character they bear impressed on their minds.

3. God's kindness and love to man, must be considered in this work of regeneration: it is a great proof of his goodness and clemency, that he once willed that his image should be impressed upon us; and would renew and restore it again after it was obliterated and deformed. The consideration of the value God set upon this restoration will still more shew forth the Divine clemency: He created man first in his image by his voice and his word; but he restored him a second time by his death and blood. Let, then, this benevolence of God in regenerating us at so great a cost, and renewing us after his image by his Holy Spirit, be a spur to us in laying aside our vices, and pursuing godliness.

So far of the twofold reasoning by which the Apostle confirms the preceding dissuasions from vice: in the next verse we have an amplification of the same reasoning.

Vers. 11. *Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.*

The Apostle has excited the Colossians to renounce their carnal and spiritual vices, by this argument chiefly; that they *had put off the old man and put on the new.* He now seems to polish and point this very argument itself: 1. By discarding the false opinion of those, who, neglecting this renewing of themselves, confided in external privileges, and despised those who were without them. 2. By substituting a true one, viz. that all external things which are esteemed excellent and honourable, avail nothing to salvation without this renewal: on the other hand, what is esteemed vile and base, in no respect hinders it, because *Christ is all in all.* Let us examine the words in their order.

Where there is neither Greek nor Jew.] That is, where there is considered no difference of nations in respect to a new or renewed man, or the state of regeneration; so that any one should hope he is more acceptable to God because he is a Jew, or fear that he is despised because he is a Gentile: Nay, If thou art a Jew, and art without this renewing, thou art a dog, and no son; if thou art a Gentile and hast it, thou art a son, and no more a dog.

We thus prove it. The difference of nation does not promote the salvation of any one if he be without sanctification, nor hinder his obtaining it if he have it: we must, therefore, seek after holiness. Hence it is that in the Scriptures the pride of the Jews, who plumed themselves on the privileges of their nation, is always rebuked. Thus in Matt. iii. 9, *Say not within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father:* and John viii. 39, to the Jews who boasted, *We have Abraham to our father,* Christ says, *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But*

ye are of your father the devil, &c. vers. 44. On the other hand, if the Gentiles were renewed and sanctified, they are shewn to be acceptable to God. See Acts x. 34, *Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him.* And Gal. iii. 7, *They which are of faith, the same are children of Abraham.* Jerome says, *It is not the sons of the saints, who obtain the places of the saints, but those who perform their works.* This is an effective argument against the impudence of the Romanists, who measure a member of the Church by this point alone, viz. that he does or does not adhere to the Papal chair. But Christ asks not whether he adhere to this or that national church, but to the true faith? not whether he be a Romanist, but whether he be renewed and sanctified? In the spiritual state, whether a man be a Greek or a Jew is not regarded; much less whether he be a Greek or a Romanist.

Circumcision nor uncircumcision.] As in the business of salvation the difference of nations affords neither prerogative nor prejudice; by similar reasoning the difference of ceremonies and external observances is of no moment. Circumcision was in the Jewish church the chief religious rite: it was used, therefore, to express the observance of all the legal rites, and uncircumcision argued the neglect of them. The Apostle, then, affirms, that neither the observation nor neglect of all the outward ceremonies is of any moment to Christians; but that internal renovation and true holiness contain the sum of our salvation.

The Christian is not commended to God by the observance of certain ceremonies or external traditions; neither is he alienated from God by the mere omission of the same. So Paul constantly teaches: Gal. vi. 15, *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.* Rom. xiv. 2, 3, *One believeth that he may eat all things; another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth.* He lays down the same rule as to the observance of days in vers. 5. But more clearly in 1 Cor. viii. 8, *But meat commendeth us not to God,*

for neither if we eat are we the better: neither if we eat not are we the worse. It is, then, a wretched thing to condemn some for meat and drink's sake, or to arrogate to ourselves holiness on account of abstinence from them.

What is said of circumcision, of meats, and of the observance of days, ought to be applied to all observations placed in external things. For these of themselves neither render men more acceptable to God by their observance; nor less acceptable to him from their omission: We must not, then, trifle about these things, but strive for mortification and sanctification.

Hence the Monks are convicted of foolish pride, who account themselves superior to all other Christians by reason of these externals; such as abstaining from certain meats, and shutting up themselves in convents, and (in one word) observing some rule of outward ceremonies invented by men. But if in Christ circumcision and uncircumcision make no difference, then the eating of flesh or fish, the living in convents or cities, and wearing frocks and hoods, has nothing in it that regards the salvation of Christians.

Barbarian or Scythian.] The former expressions seem particularly directed to the Jews, who considered themselves more acceptable and agreeable to God than others from the prerogatives of their nation and their ritual observances. The present are directed at the Greeks, who, refined by the knowledge of philosophy and the liberal arts, despised other nations, and considered them almost as brutes in comparison with themselves. The Apostle, therefore, says, this barbarism is no hindrance to those engrafted in Christ and truly renewed and sanctified. He mentions the Scythians by name, since they were accounted the most fierce of all barbarians; as if he had said, Not even the most barbarous barbarism should be any ground of prejudice against those who are enlightened by faith and renewed by the Spirit of God. Epiphanius,* almost in the very begin-

* Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus, in the fourth Century. He was born about the year 332, at a village in the neighbourhood of Eleutheropolis, in Palestine, and appears to have been educated in Egypt, where he imbibed the principles of the Gnostics. At length he left those heretics,

ning of his first book against the eighty heresies, calls barbarism Scythism; and says, that barbarism flourished in the ten first generations of the world, afterwards that Scythism prevailed from the flood to the destruction of the tower of Babel. But I confess that I do not clearly understand the reason of this distinction; that the Scythians are so joined to the Barbarians, I think is for the sake of amplification, and not of distinction: which also seemed the case to Ambrose, who writes that the Scythians are distinguished from other Barbarians in this place because they surpassed the rest in rudeness of manners.

No pious and holy man is to be esteemed nothing worth, because he is of unpolished manners and destitute of literary attainments. It is not elegance of manners but innocence of life, not erudition but faith, which commends us to God. *Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise,* 1 Cor. i. 26. So Augustine heretofore exclaimed, *The unlearned arise and seize on heaven; and lo, where we with our heartless learning wallow in the mire of flesh and blood!* Confess. lib. 8. cap. 8. A barbarian ignorance of other things is no hindrance to one who knows Christ,

and becoming an ascetic, returned to Palestine, and adopted this discipline of Hilarion, the founder of Monachism in that country. Epiphanius erected a Monastery near the place of his birth, over which he presided till he was elected to the See of Salamis, in 367. In 391 he commenced a controversy with John Bishop of Jerusalem, relative to the opinions of Origen, which Epiphanius condemned. In the course of this dispute, as in others in which he was involved, he displayed more zeal than charity or prudence; particularly when in the height of his resentment against the favourers of Origen, he sent word to the Empress Eudoxia, who requested his prayers for her son Theodosius, who was ill, that the prince should not die, provided she would discard the heretics who enjoyed the imperial patronage. Epiphanius died in 402 or 403, on returning from Constantinople to Cyprus. He was a man of great learning, but deficient in judgment and accuracy. His work entitled "Panarion," against heresies, is reckoned as a piece of Ecclesiastical history; but the carelessness or ignorance of the author as to facts and opinions, deducts much from its authority. The best edition of the writings of Epiphanius is that of Petavius, Paris, 2 vols. folio; reprinted at Cologne, in 1682.—*Gorton.*

and lives after his law: but even an angelic knowledge of all things profits nothing to one who lives impurely, and knows not Christ: for *in Christ there is neither Barbarian nor Scythian,*

Bond nor free.] All these expressions have the same import, and signify, that a high or low station in the world is not to be considered by a Christian as if the one were nearer, the other farther from salvation. The condition of slaves among the antients was most unjust and wretched: they esteemed slaves as only animated tools, which their master could use as he pleased; yea, they claimed to themselves the power of life and death over them as over their cattle. Notwithstanding this vile and abject condition, the Apostle says there is no difference between the slave and his master as far as concerns salvation: For the slave, if he be renewed after the image of God, is acknowledged as a son; his master, if he remain wicked and impure, is rejected as a spurious offspring.* Now what is said of slavery and freedom is applicable to the noble and the ignoble, the rich and the poor; in one word, to all the different conditions of mortals in this world. For truly says Jerome, *Our Religion knows nothing of the persons and conditions of men, but regards their souls.* And Lactantius, Instit. lib. 5. cap. 15, *No one is poor in the eye of God, but he who lacks righteousness; no one rich unless he abound in virtues; no one, lastly, great, unless he be good and innocent,* &c. But we must here beware lest we consider the Christian Religion as confounding political order, and the various ranks of men. The Apostle does not say that bond and free are not to exist in this world: but that these dis-

* Is this representation of Slavery under heathenism centuries ago, more remarkable than in this age of the extension of professed Christianity? Will it not be a matter of greater surprise to the world a few centuries hence, that it was upheld in a corresponding existence, if not worse in regard to the treatment of the Slave, by Christian Britain in the nineteenth Century? Is the reasoning applied to the case in reference to the soul and eternity less applicable *now* than it was formerly? Let any one peruse but half the Reports of the condition of things in our West Indian possessions elicited by Parliamentary investigations, and the Reports of the Missionaries, say for the last ten years, and then judge.

tinctions are not found in Christ, or in a spiritual state of salvation. He who here affirms, that in the new man *there is neither bond nor free,* in 1 Tim. vi. 1, commands *servants who are under the yoke, to count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.* This also Augustine teaches in these words, Expos. in Epist. ad Rom. propos. 72, *It behoves us as far as this life is concerned, to be subject to powers; but as to our believing in God and being called to his kingdom, we need not be subject to any man who would divert us from it.*

Thus far it has been shewn, in opposition to this false and vain presumption of many, that external circumstances of any kind can avail nothing without this internal renewing of the heart: and that no condition, however vile and abject, forms an objection, if the Spirit of God be present regenerating and purifying the heart from sin. To this error the Apostle again opposes a true judgment, which he expresses more affirmatively in these concluding words, BUT CHRIST IS ALL AND IN ALL.] What the Jews hoped for from the privilege of their nation and the sign of the covenant, the Greeks from their philosophy, princes and great men from their dignity; all these things, and others far more excellent, the man that is born again enjoys in Christ. On the other hand; whatever blemish there may be thought, in being sprung from Gentile or Barbarian, in being born in uncircumcision, or in any low condition or mean station; all these things are divested of all disgrace and dishonour through Christ living in the renewed; and, consequently, this renewed state is of the utmost value. For *Christ* (regenerating them and uniting himself with the renewed) *is all* that which is necessary to salvation; *in all,* namely, in all the faithful who are thus sanctified and united to Christ. He is all things to them, *meritoriously:* for since they become one mystical person with Christ, he imparts to them the merit of his passion, death, obedience, and righteousness; and thus *he is made* to them *of God wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption,* 1 Cor. i. 30. He is all things to them *efficaciously;* for whatever they possess or can do, as regards

spiritual life and obtaining salvation, they possess from Christ and can do by him. *And I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me,* Gal. ii. 20; and 1 Cor. xv. 10, *But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.* It can, therefore, want no more explanation, but stands plainly before us, that Christ is all things in all the regenerate.

Corollaries.

1. Christ and his Spirit renewing us is not esteemed of sufficient value by us, unless we esteem this *new man* of such great value, that we consider all other things, which men generally think make them honourable or despicable, as nothing in comparison.

2. Here the pride and vanity of those who glory in any earthly dignity is put down; since any one of the regenerate is more noble and more free than they; and is more nearly allied to God, and like him who is the fountain of honour.

Thus far on that part of the Apostle's admonition which respects the laying aside our vices: the other, which refers to the exercise of virtues, remains to be treated; to this he had fortified and paved the way by shewing that they had not only put off the old man, but had put on the new.

Verses 12, 13.

Put on therefore as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering.

Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.

In the former part of the general exhortation, the Apostle advised the putting off and casting away of all vices, as members of the old Adam. We now come to the second part of the exhortation; in which he exhorts the Colossians to put on and exercise all virtues; and this part is extended as far as verse 18.

This last division of the Apostle's exhortation consists of three parts. In the first he excites to those virtues which immediately regard our neighbours; and whether they be miserable and need our aid; or wicked and injurious to us; or in any other case, as expressed in vers. 12, 13, 14, 15. In the second he calls them to the study, knowledge, and use of the Divine word; by the ministry of which we are instructed and taught in the above virtues: see vers. 16. Thirdly, and lastly, he prescribes to the Colossians an universal rule to be observed on all occasions, in vers. 17.

With respect to the verse which we have in hand, three things are to be considered: the agreement of this exhortation with what went before; the preliminaries to the exhortation, and the exhortation itself.

1. First, it is proper to observe the agreement or dependence which the illative particle *therefore* intimates to us. This word requires us to look back to the 10th verse, where the Apostle states that they *had put on the new man*; whence he here infers, *therefore put on bowels of mercies*, &c. As if he had said, They who have put on the new

man, ought to put on all his members, and all his properties: but these virtues are as the members and properties of the new man; therefore, are to be put on by you who have put him on. He uses the same argument before, when from the circumstance of their having put off the old man, he inferred, *Mortify therefore its members, fornication, uncleanness,* &c.

Corollaries from this inference.

1. We must seek to make the new man entire and perfect in all his members: for as the natural body appears deformed if deprived of an eye, a hand, or a foot, or any other of its members; so it is with the spiritual man, if he lack any of his parts.

2. They have little or no sense of spiritual life, who do not perceive, or perceiving do not grieve for, or grieving for do not endeavour with all their might to amend and supply, this mutilation of the new man.

3. Scarcely will an individual be found who, as far as respects this new man, is not a monster either from deficiency or superabundance of limbs: I mean wanting in the members he ought to have, or supplied with those he should be without. But if we would attend to the Apostle, we shall understand, that from the fact of our having put off the old Adam, and put on the new man, we are bound to suffer any inconvenience which may occur in either respect. Thus much of the illative particle *therefore.*

2. *As elect of God holy and beloved.*] We here come, secondly, to the preliminaries, or the reason on which the exhortation is grounded, why these virtues should be adopted by the Colossians. This is drawn from what is *fit* and *honourable:* for these three attributes by which their condition is described, prove them to be bound to these virtues and to holiness of life. Let us consider them apart.

As elect of God.] This may be understood either of an eternal or temporal election, by which Christians are separated from the filth of the world to serve God according to the precepts of the Gospel. And I consider the Apostle means this latter election; which yet, if it be effica-

cious, presupposes the former one. But whether he means this or that, he speaks precisely to the purpose. For the consideration of our gratuitous election before the foundations of the world were laid, ought not to induce us to sloth, but influence us with eagerness to perpetual holiness of life; since God hath chosen us to this end: as it is said in Ephes. i. 4, *he hath chosen us in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy,* &c. The same applies to temporal election, whereby we are called into the Church, and separated for a peculiar people of God; for this privilege also obliges us to cultivate holiness. This is a stipulation God makes with the Israelites, Deut. xxvi. 18, *The Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, that thou shouldest keep all his commandments.* So also Christ stipulates with a Christian, 2 Tim. ii. 19, *The Lord knoweth them that are his: And let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* Let, then, every one who believes himself elect of God, live as the elect of God.

Those, consequently, who prate about their eternal election, and boast of their Christian profession, while in their deeds and in their manner of life they shew themselves neither elect nor Christians, are here reproved: but as the lazy Greeks made a profession of philosophy, so do these men of their Christianity: *it was all talk and no doing.* But we ought not to become like the idle philosophers; for as Tertullian gravely argues, Apologet. cap. 46, *What analogy is there between the philosopher and the Christian? the disciple of Greece and of Heaven? the trader for an empty name, and for life? the artificer of words and of deeds?*

Holy.] That is by baptism and the sanctification of the Spirit. In the administration of baptism itself, Christians are consecrated to God; they are renewed after the Divine image by the internal operation of the Spirit: in each respect they are called *holy;* by each they are bound to a holy life. For whatever is consecrated to God, should in some way participate in the Divine holiness. Hence that passage of Levit. xi. 44, *Ye shall be holy, for I am holy;* and Chap. xx. 26, *Ye shall be holy unto me: for I the Lord*

am holy, and have severed you from other people that ye should be mine. Being then by baptism separated and consecrated to God, we ought to put on all virtues, and exercise perpetual holiness of life.

Besides, what things are consecrated to God, are not to be applied to any purpose, but always to be used according to the Divine will; which is seen plain enough in temples, vessels, and other inanimate things: How much more, then, should this be attended to in men consecrated to God by baptism? Now it clearly appears that *the will of God* is *our sanctification,* 1 Thess. iv. 3: whence Nazianzen calls baptism, *the covenant of a more holy life with God;* and Peter, 1 Epis. iii. 21, *The answer of a good conscience towards God.* Inasmuch, then, as we are holy by baptism, we ought to lead a life holy and adorned with virtues.

Wherefore that internal operation of the Holy Spirit, in which all true Christians participate, requires the same from them even as it were in its own right. For the operation of the Spirit brings new life; new life brings new strength; and these require new manners and actions. Hence arises that exhortation of the Apostle to the regenerate and sanctified, Rom. vi. 19, *Now yield your members servants unto righteousness unto holiness. Now,* that is, since the Holy Spirit hath inspired holiness, so walk as *holy.* Thus much of the second attribute.

And beloved.] This is the third attribute, by mentioning which he would excite the Colossians to put on and exercise the virtues. Now he does not speak of the love of the eternal benevolence, with which God embraced the elect before the foundations of the world; for notwithstanding this love, they are accounted among rebels and enemies to God prior to their effectual calling and regeneration. Rom. v. 10, and Ephes. ii. 12. He speaks, then, of the love of friendship, by which God receives into the number of his children the elect, when actually converted and grafted into Christ; as in John i. 12, *But as many as received him* (Christ) *to them gave he power to become the sons of God.* They, therefore, who are beloved after this manner, ought as the beloved to put on all the virtues which are agreeable to God;

1. Because it behoves one beloved mutually to love God: but the proof of love is the exercise of virtue; *If ye love me, keep my commandments,* John xiv. 15.

2. Because it behoves one beloved to frame himself to the likeness of God who loves him: for as love arises from a similitude of dispositions, so does enmity arise from their dissimilitude.

Corollaries.

1. They who do not cultivate virtue and holiness, are not only impure but sacrilegious; since they pollute by a disorderly life, their bodies and souls, which were sacred to God.

2. It is but folly for one to presume that he is loved of God, or that he loves God, who neglects to put on the ornaments of virtue: since they are at once signs of the Divine love towards us, and of ours towards God. For God always adorns those whom he loves by infusing virtues and gifts; and they who love God worship him and honour him by the exercise of virtue. So much of the arguments which the Apostle uses as preliminaries to the exhortation itself.

3. We now come, in the last place, to the matter of the exhortation contained in these words, *Put on bowels of mercies, kindness,* &c. Here it is proper to consider the act of putting on, and the things or virtues so put on.

Put ye on.] This is a figurative expression taken from garments. But since in things spoken metaphorically we are not to suppose a similitude in all respects, it will not be foreign to the matter if we briefly note in what respects virtues are like garments, and in what they are unlike.

They are like: 1. Because as garments adorn the body; so do virtues the soul. 2. Because as he who is stript of his clothes appears base and mean in the eyes of men; so does the man stript of virtues, to God, to angels, and to pious men. 3. Because as clothes are not derived from the human body; so true virtues are not of the will of man, but the gift of God. Hence that definition of the Schoolmen, *Virtue is that good quality of the mind which constitutes a virtuous life, and which God works in us,* Albert, lib. 5.

cap. 5; and Prosper is of the same opinion, De vita contempl. lib. 3. cap. 1 and 16, *Virtues are neither sought after nor possessed without the gift of God.*

Virtues and garments differ: 1. Because the latter are daily put on and off; but it is sinful to throw aside virtues once put on. 2. Because garments do not become better, but worse from daily wear; but virtues continually augment and strengthen by exercise. 3. Because we can procure clothes by our own efforts; but virtues cannot be obtained but by the gift of another, namely, God.

Here it may be asked, Why he bids the Colossians to put on virtues, when it is said that true virtue is infused into the human mind by God; and why, too, does he bid them to put on what he had before said that they had put on?

I answer, it is clear from what preceded, that he addresses those whom he presupposes to be regenerate, holy, and endowed with infused virtues; and, therefore, to *put on bowels of mercies, kindness,* &c. denotes nothing more than daily to advance and exercise in their lives the virtues impressed upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit. But now, although it is the work of God alone to infuse into the heart spiritual gifts and virtues proceeding from grace, yet, human co-operation is required in the exercise of them: See for instance Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 10, *By the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.*

As to the other part of the objection, it may also be added; the elect and holy who have put on virtues and gifts by the life-giving aid of the Holy Spirit, both can and ought to put on the same more and more; which, indeed, they are said to do, when they endeavour that these gifts of the Spirit may be confirmed and augmented by use and exercise. For although the power of increasing does not agree very well with the clothing of the body, yet it does with these garments of the mind. As Peter says, in 2 Epis. iii. 18, *Grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord.* These things may suffice concerning the act

of putting on: It follows that we notice the virtues themselves to be put on.

Bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering.] He begins with those duties which we owe when in prosperity to our neighbours in adversity. And, in the first place, the Apostle requires us to put on *bowels of mercies*, that is, the real inward and unpretended affection of condoling with another's woe. The phrase is a Hebraism, which the Apostle frequently uses, even in the New Testament. And it is taken from the emotion, and, as it were, concussion which is felt in the stomach, in deep affections of the mind. Thus it is said of Joseph, Gen. xliii. 30, *his bowels did yearn*, or were set on fire *towards his brother*. So in Lamentations ii. 11, *My bowels are troubled, my liver is poured on the earth for the destruction of the daughter of my people*. In the New Testament also the same phrase is used: See Luke i. 78; Phil. ii. 1. The most tender affection is, therefore, intended by the expression *bowels of mercies*. The Apostle wisely begins with the expression of condolence; because from hence flows the act of relief; and because, as says Gregory, Mor. 20. 27, *It is more to compassionate any one from the heart, than to give: for he who gives what is external, gives what does not belong to his own person; but he who gives compassion, gives somewhat of himself.*

The chief objects of this compassion are persons who have none to give them relief, as widows and orphans; but, in general, it comprehends all oppressed with misery, whether the poor, prisoners, the sick, the afflicted, &c.

We have many motives or incentives to this affection of mercy.

1. We have the express and oft repeated command of God: Luke vi. 36, *Be ye merciful:* Rom. xii. 15, *Weep with them that weep;* and 1 Pet. iii. 8, *Be ye kindly affectioned,* &c. Whence Gregory Nazianzen says, Orat. 16, *If thou hast nothing, give but a tear; for pity is a great solace to the afflicted.*

2. We have, besides, the examples of the prophets, of Christ, and the Apostles, and, lastly, of all good men:

Jer. ix. 1; Matt. ix. 36; Luke xix. 41; 2 Cor. xi 29. Hence that saying of the Poet, *The good are tear-abounding men.*

3. We have, lastly, the conformity of nature, and the possibility of suffering similar things. For nothing is more agreeable to nature, than to be touched with the evils and misfortunes of those who are partakers of the same nature with us. This the Apostle points out, Heb. ii. 17, where he says of Christ, that *it behoved* him *to be made like his brethren that he might be a merciful and faithful High priest.* The possibility of suffering similar evils, when seriously considered, forces mercy from any man that is not destitute of feeling: For what has happened to some one may happen to any one; which even Aristotle acknowledges, Rhet. 2. cap. 18.

Hence we conclude,

1. The apathy (ἀπάθεια) of the Stoics must be exploded by a Christian; as not agreeing either with our natural condition or our supernatural regeneration. Prosper, De vit. contempl. 30, 31, well remarks, *We are not in fault for having affections, but for making a bad use of them.*

2. Bowels of mercy are found in every regenerate person: he is therefore moved at the very first view of another's misery.

3. They who, ere they can be excited to mercy, must have much solicitation, bewailing, and clamour from the afflicted, can lay claim to little or nothing of the spiritual man: they who are not moved by these, have nothing human in them.

Kindness.] From the affection, the Apostle passes to the act; because the pity of the rich without kindness is but the illusion of the wretched. Augustine properly defines true pity to be, *compassion in our heart for another's distress, such as will lead us to assist where we are able. Thus by compassion the mind grieves,* says Gregory, *as the liberal hand shews this affection of grief.* Consequently, these two, *mercy and kindness,* must always be joined together, as James recommends, Chap. ii. 16, and John, 1 Epis. iii. 17. Whatever they pretend, they who have their hands closed,

have their bowels of mercy closed too, or rather they have none. But we shall also adduce some motives for this *kindness* or *liberality*.

The first shall be what ought to prompt us to all good works, the command of God and our Lord. For it is not the case (as the vulgar vainly imagine) that works of justice alone fall under the precept, and works of mercy are left to our own will. God distinctly requires of us works of beneficence, and severely punishes their omission. *Break thy bread with the hungry,* Isa. lviii. 7. See Matt. xxv. 41, 42, &c.

Secondly, the duty of dispensing their wealth is imposed upon all the rich. Hence benevolence towards the poor is called *righteousness,* Prov. xi. 18. And they are reproached with theft by the Fathers, who, when they might, assist not the poor. Hence that charge of Basil: *The bread which you withhold is the bread of your servant; the garment which you keep is the garment of the naked; and the money you lay up is the money of the poor.* And Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 16, says, *May it not be my unhappy lot to grow rich while the poor are in want, and I not succour them in their distress,* &c.

Thirdly, A reward is promised by God to those who are beneficent towards the poor: A reward, I say, both in this life and in the life which is to come. That it is in this life see Ps. cxii. 5, &c. Prov. xi. 25, and xxviii. 27. For that which is to come, see Matt. xxv. 34, Luke xiv. 14, Gal. vi. 9. The testimonies of the Fathers to this are very numerous; and hence the exhortations to benevolence. *We lose all earthly things by keeping them; we preserve them by giving,* says Greg. Hom. 17. in Evang. *It is gain to give to the poor,* says Basil, Serm. 1, in Avaros. *Why fearest thou to render everlasting thy frail and transitory goods, or to entrust thy treasures to God's safe keeping?* asks Lactantius, lib. 6. cap. 12. And Jerom, ad Nepotian says, *I do not remember to have read of an unhappy death of any one who had liberally exercised the works of charity; for such an one has many intercessors.*

Humbleness of mind.] The Apostle well joins this to *mercy*

and *kindness;* since, as Augustine observes, *there are many who would more readily give all they have to feed the poor, than become beggars themselves before God.* Indeed it often happens, that works of charity and mercy give occasion for pomp and pride. In whatever condition we are, then, we have need to *put on humility:* In prosperity (that is, when we abound in temporal or spiritual riches), lest we become insolent towards God, as in the case of Uzziah, 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, and of the Israelites, Hosea xiii. 6; lest we despise and oppress our neighbour as did Haman, in Esther iii. 6; or the Pharisee, in Luke xviii. 11. For, as Gregory has remarked, *It is a rare thing for a person who is preeminent in many respects not to despise any one.* In adversity too; lest we murmur against God, as the Israelites did; or despond in mind under our afflictions.

The following reflections will engender humbleness of mind in us:—

1. If we consider that whatever good thing we have, it does not come from ourselves, but from God; that it is small, in comparison of the virtues we are without, and the sins with which we are beset; and that we have abused this little good in many ways.

2. If we reflect that it is an especial part of the image of the devil, to admire one's self; but a part of the image of Christ to be humble and lowly, Matt. xi. 29. Whence Augustine says, de Trinit. 4. 10, *The prince of pride brings to death the man who indulges pride; Christ the Lord of humility brings to life the man who obeys.*

3. If we observe how God is affected towards the humble; viz. in that he has respect to them before others, Isa. lxvi. 2; and beyond all others he adorns and enriches them more and more with his gifts, Matt. xi. 25; Psal. xviii. 27; Luke i. 52, 53. Parisiensis not unaptly calls the human heart *a spiritual vacuum.* And as nature does not suffer a corporeal vacuum, but rather impels some bodies into places not suited to their nature; so the grace of God does not allow of a spiritual vacuum in the heart of the humble, but sends streams of heavenly blessings to fill it.

4. If we remark what mind God bears towards the

proud: viz. that he accounts them his greatest enemies, and pursues them with his wrath even to destruction. *He destroys the house of the proud,* Prov. xv. 25; *God resisteth the proud,* &c. 1 Pet. v. 5. From which Gregory, on that passage 1 Sam. xv. 17, WHEN THOU WAST LITTLE IN THINE OWN EYES, says, *Thou wast great in mine eyes, because lowly in thine own: now art thou abased before me, because great in thine own sight.* Therefore how much any one is precious in his own eyes, by so much he becomes more base before God.

Lastly, if we bear in mind that pride is the poison of all virtues, and of all good deeds. Whence Augustine (on Ps. xciii.) concludes, *Humility in evil deeds is more pleasing to God, than pride in good ones.* He, therefore, who combines other virtues without humility, does but bear chaff against the wind. On this account God determined that it was better for his holy Apostle to be buffetted by Satan, than to be inflated by the sin of pride, 2 Cor. xii. 7.

Meekness, long-suffering.] These two virtues are the daughters of *humility,* of which we have the greatest need in adversity, and when we have business with morose, reproachful, and wicked men; for they become as a shield to us. As to *meekness;* it is that virtue which renders a man manageable in common intercourse, and prevents him from being exasperated beyond measure and justice at the follies, stubbornness, and lighter faults of others, even when they tend to his own injury or disadvantage. It is such a moderator of passion, that it absolutely restrains what is unjust, and so tempers and softens what is just, that it is neither rashly excited, nor borne headlong beyond its proper limits. A humble-minded man (πραος) is not badly described by Aristotle, Ethic. 4, 5, when he says that he is not driven headlong by unbridled passion, but *is angry so far, so long, and against the person right reason enjoins;* and, in a word, *is not given to revenge, but rather easy to be appeased.*

We must strive after this virtue on many accounts.

1. Because it resides not with the good and perfect, but among those who often sin, from infirmity and igno-

rance; which even we ourselves do. *It is but just*, therefore, *that one requiring pardon for his offences should in his turn grant it.* Which also the Apostle advises, Gal. vi. 1, *Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.*

2. Because it brings the greatest utility to us, in rendering life pleasant and tranquil: while the passionate and angry are daily driven to madness, by the injuries they give and receive on every side. *The meek*, says the Psalmist, *shall inherit the earth; they shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.* Ps. xxxvii. 11.

3. Because it is a sign and an essential mark of the sons of God, and of those destined to eternal happiness. *Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God*, Matt. v. 9.

4. Because we have exhibited to us a living model of meekness in God himself (Jonah iv. 2; Joel ii. 13); the Son of God (1 Pet. ii. 23); and, in fine, in all the servants of God; as Moses (Num. xii. 3); David (2 Saml. xvi. 10, 11); Paul (1 Thess. ii. 7), *We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her own children.*

Long-suffering, μακροθυμιαν.] This is not very different from the preceding virtue, unless that it seems to refer to injuries of a more grievous nature done to us by men, and severer calamities sent by God himself. Therefore we should not only bear with calmness and meekness, the follies, infirmities, and daily and customary injuries of men; but even if we should be annoyed and oppressed, however bitterly and maliciously, we must bear it with a great and generous mind.

1. On account of the Divine Providence which orders and disposes all these things, and to which it is right for a servant of God to submit. This we find to have been done by Job, David, and Christ himself; who, when evil entreated by the wicked, patiently obeyed the will of God.

2. On account of the advantage derived therefrom. For griefs and injuries greatly conduce to cure the diseases of the soul; to beat down pride, to extinguish the love of the

world, as well as to shake off spiritual lethargy. Besides, they shew forth the virtues of the pious and the glory of God, and augment the reward and crown promised to the saints: In one word, they always *work together for good to them who love God,* Rom. viii. 28.

3. On account of our consciousness of sin and demerit. For whatever evils are brought upon us by the malice of men, are permitted by the justice of God. He would inflict far heavier if he treated us according to our deserts. So the godly have ever acknowledged; Nehem. ix. 33; Dan. ix. 8.

4. On account of the worth and excellence of affliction. For it is not reproach (as the vulgar think) to suffer for Christ, or be trampled upon by the wicked; but, on the contrary, honourable. Whence says Peter, 1 Epis. iv. 16, *If any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.* So the Apostles were animated; *they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name,* Acts v, 41. *We should rejoice in afflictions,* says Parisiensis, *because we are received to the communion of the sufferings of Christ, as it were to drink in common of the royal cup.* In this sense also it is said in Philippians i. 29, *Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.*

From what has been said of these two virtues we gather,

That they are not to be accounted happy nor men of fortitude, who in this world commit violence and oppress others, and do what they please against whom they please under the impulse of their fury and lust. They are not happy; since this is both the signal and the cause of their future damnation, Phi. i. 28: nor men of fortitude; for this is the effect of the old and impotent Adam, and shews them to be destitute of the sanctifying Spirit and all its gifts and ornaments.

On the other hand, We infer from the foregoing; that they who bear with a meek spirit the injuries and reproaches of the wicked, are neither base nor miserable; but happy

and valiant, as endowed with the Spirit of God, covered with his gifts as arms of defence, and by their means conquerors over all evil.

Vers. 13. *Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.*

In these words the Apostle shews the use and requires the practice of the afore-mentioned virtues of meekness and long-suffering. It is of little moment to have virtues, if you neglect to exercise them when occasion offers. But in this verse three things are to be remarked: 1. The actions required; two for instance: the action of suffering, *forbearing one another;* the action of forgiving, *and forgiving one another.* 2. The object of these actions (viz. the μομφη) i. e. *the just cause of complaint.* 3. The rule of these our actions, viz. the example of Christ, *as Christ also hath forgiven,* &c.

Forbearing one another.] Here is the first act of the before-named virtues. Now he is said *to forbear* who, though attacked and wounded either by words or deeds, does not immediately rise up to inflict revenge; but endeavours to overcome his enemy with mildness and to bring him back to a proper mind.

However this forbearance under injuries is accounted mean among the proud, yet by the wise it is esteemed the best and most glorious way of conquest; and that on many accounts. For

1. He who bears injuries, overcomes and conquers himself, whilst he represses and restrains the desire for revenge always boiling forth from our corrupt nature; and binds and confines that wrath, as it were a furious monster, lurking within him. This mode of conquest Solomon cele-

brates in Prov. xvi. 32, *He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city. To conquer oneself is the greatest of conquests,* says Plato.

2. He who forbears, conquers the very malice of his enemy. For when two contraries are in contention and conflict, that is said to conquer which draws the other into similarity with itself; that to be conquered, which is drawn or changed by the other. Therefore, like as we say water is overcome by fire, when it becomes warm; and, on the contrary, to have overcome it, if, retaining its own cold, it can subdue the fire: so we say a Christian is overcome by a wicked man, as often as he, by the provocation of attack, is drawn into similar fury; on the contrary, we may pronounce him to have conquered when he retains his own disposition, and, by bearing with the violence of the other, changes and mollifies his ferocity. See a beautiful example 1 Sam. xxiv. 17, &c.; where David, by forbearing, and refraining from revenge, so mollifies and changes Saul, that from breathing blood and slaughter, he melts into tears and entreaties, confesses his fault, and is compelled to acknowledge and extol David's innocence and meekness. Who does not here see the malice of Saul overcome, and the patience of David triumphing?

3. He who forbears, not only conquers, but conquers by lawful means, and those which God commands his soldiers to use. Now it behoves a soldier obeying the command of his general, not only to fight, but to do it with those arms, and in that manner which is assigned him. *No one receiveth the crown unless he strive lawfully,* 2 Tim. ii. 5. But hear the decree of our commander, Prov. xxiv. 29, *Say not I will do so to him as he hath done to me; I will render to the man according to his work. Recompence to no man evil for evil,* Rom. xii. 17; and again, vers. 21, *Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.* So much for the act of forbearing.

And forgiving one another.] In this second act there is more contained than in the former. For there are some who sometimes bear injuries, because, forsooth, they can-

not avenge them, or because they do not think it expedient; yet in the mean time the injury is treasured up in their memory, malice rages in their hearts, and a thirst for revenge burns. The Apostle, therefore, would have us, not only bear an injury, but remove from our hearts the very desire itself of revenge; nay, that we should cherish a love for our most bitter enemies. Here applies the precept of Christ, Matt. xviii. 35, *That every one forgive his brother from his heart:* and Luke vi. 27, 28, *Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you.* We read that all this was religiously observed by Christians in the primitive Church. *It is the custom of all to love their friends; of Christians alone to love their enemies,* says Tertul. ad Scap.

Hence we are instructed

1. That those are in error who think that the forgiving of injuries and loving our enemies is matter of counsel and not of precept: for the Apostle teaches us that this belongs to *all the elect of God, holy and beloved,* that is, to all the regenerate.

2. They who forgive others profit themselves, yea, remove their own sins in some measure: whence in the Greek the phrase is χαριζομενοι ἑαυτοις, *remitting* or *forgiving your own selves.* And Jerome writes on Ephes. v. *What good one does to another is laid up more for him who performs the deed, than for him for whom it is performed.* And Christ most plainly says, Matt. vi. 15, *If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses.*

3. No one walks so cautiously, but that he sometimes offends against his neighbour both in words and deeds. Hence the Apostle says, *forgiving one another;* as if we all had need of this mutual forgiveness. Thus much as to the actions required; viz. *forbearing and forgiving.*

If any man have a quarrel against any.] Here we have the object or matter about which *forbearing and forgiving* is to be exercised, viz. *a quarrel,* that is, some just cause of complaint.

Here we must remark that all the words are put indefi-

nitely, and are therefore to be received universally, in this manner; *If any man,* that is, whoever in truth he may be, whether superior or inferior: *shall have a quarrel,* that is, any cause of complaint whatever, on account of any wrong done either in word or deed: *against any,* viz. whether friend or foe; let him know that the duty of forbearing and forgiving is necessarily imposed upon him.

Corollaries.

1. If a *just cause* is not a sufficient ground for inflicting revenge, it is evident that they grievously offend who break forth into disputes and strifes for trifling and nugatory causes, nay, for those that are unjust and absolutely nothing. See Matt. xviii. 28.

2. Since the act of forbearing and forgiving is required from all towards all, the pride of the great and the rich is rebuked, who think themselves exempt from this duty: as if only the poor and weak were born to bear injuries, and the powerful and noble to inflict them. But the Scripture has not respect for nobility, power, or riches, but for fraternity, when it speaks of the forgiveness of injuries. See Matt. xviii. 21.

It is asked, If this duty of forbearing and forgiving be so necessary to a Christian, that it is not lawful for him in any way to repel an injury done to him, or to restrain or punish the person who offers it; but is bound *when he is smitten on one cheek to turn the other;* or *when his cloak is taken away to offer his coat also?* as Christ says, Matt. v. 39, 40.

We reply, That it is not by any means lawful for a private person by himself, and according to the dictates of his own will, to seek his own revenge; but it is sometimes lawful to do it by means of the magistrate and according to his judgment. Neither ought we to seek our revenge through the magistrate himself with an exasperated and corrupt mind, that is, with the passion of anger and hatred against our neighbour; but with a peaceful and meek mind, that is, from a zeal for righteousness, and a desire for the amendment of our neighbour: for it is better to lose any thing of this world, than to make a wreck of our patience

and Christian charity. On the other hand, that it is lawful to seek the aid of the magistrate against those who do us injury is evident hence; 1. Because God himself, who approves nothing contrary to charity, hath ordained magistrates and tribunals. 2. Because laws in all well organised states are enacted for the repairing of injuries; which laws would remain absolutely useless if it was unlawful to recur to their assistance against evil-doers. 3. Because it is profitable even to evil-doers themselves, that they should be punished for their crimes, and that the plunder they obtain by doing injury to others should be taken from them: Hence it may sometimes happen, that charity requires us to take vengeance of the wicked: for *he is overcome with the advantage of victory on his side,* says Augustine, *from whom the liberty of doing injury is taken away.* August. Epist. 5, ad Marcell. As to what our Saviour says and the other similar passages of Scripture, we maintain that they should be interpreted according to the context. Thus, *when you shall be smitten on one cheek, turn the other,* that is, rather than break out yourself into revenge, and inflict the same injury upon another. We say, too, that such passages are to be understood with this limitation: Do so as often as the glory of God and the good of our neighbour seems to require it. These, therefore, are necessary precepts (as the Schoolmen say out of Augustine,) as far as the *preparation of the mind* is concerned; and they are to be followed in the *outward act,* as often as the glory of God and the good of our neighbour requires. See more on this point in Augustine, Epist. 5, ad Marcellinum.

Even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye.] Supply the word *forgive.* The example of Christ ought to have with Christians both the force of an argument for persuasion and of a rule for direction, as far as forbearing and forgiving are concerned; the force of an argument; because the members ought to correspond to their head. A proud or a feeble member is inconsistent with a head which is humble and crowned with thorns. Hence by Christ himself and his Apostles, the example of Christ is urged principally in those things which relate to charity and the humility of his

sufferings. *If I have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet: for I have given you an example,* John xiii. 14. *Christ hath suffered for us, leaving us an example,* 1 Pet. ii. 21. *He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked,* 1 John ii. 6. The example of Christ has, moreover, the force of a rule in directing us, inasmuch as it contains the most perfect model of virtue. Hence Bernard says, *What have you to do with virtues, who are ignorant of the virtues of Christ? Where, I beseech you, will ye find true prudence, but in the doctrine of Christ? where true temperance, but in the life of Christ? Where true fortitude, but in the passion of Christ?* But let us evince this in our acts of forbearing and forgiving: in which we have a perfect rule for imitation, whether we regard what Christ bore and forgave, or from whom, or, in fine, in what manner he bore and forgave.

As to *what* he bore and forgave? It was curses, and those the most grievous and bitter: for he was called a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, one possessed of a devil, one using the assistance of dæmons, a madman, a blasphemer, an impostor;* and, in fine, what not? He suffered evil entreatment too, being spit upon, being beaten with rods, lastly, being crucified. Yet all these so many and so great injuries he bore and forgave.

From whom? From the chiefs of the people, from the people themselves, from the ignorant, from the wicked, from strangers and from countrymen, from Jews and Gentiles; in short, being injured by every description of men, he bore with them all, he pardoned them all.

In what manner? Not from such infirmity as rendered him unable to resist; but from humility and voluntary obedience, which made him willing to suffer. Isa. liii. 7; Matt. xxvi. 53. Not with a treacherous and deceitful intention, meditating and seeking future vengeance; but with a pure heart inflamed with love, intreating from God the Father a gracious forgiveness for his enemies; Luke

* Matt. xi. 19; John vii. 20; Luke xi. 18.

xxiii. 34. Such was the perfect bearing of injuries and the forgiveness of Christ, of which the Apostle speaks in saying, *As Christ has forgiven you, so also do ye.* We ought therefore, to compare ourselves with this example; and although we cannot attain to its perfection, yet we should remember always to propose to ourselves its imitation.

We derive the following instructions;

1. It behoves a Christian to be certain of the pardon of his sins through Christ: since this pardoning is the rule and measure of pardoning others; but a rule ought to be fixed and certain.

2. He who does not freely pardon others, never feels in his heart the benefit of Christ pardoning his sins: neither can he who has not resolved to forgive his neighbour, conclude that his own sins are forgiven of God.

3. In vain does the mind eager for revenge excuse its own malice by the extent of the injury done, and by the loss to the man's own character if revenge be neglected, and other points of the like nature, by which men are accustomed to inflame themselves with revenge. All these considerations vanish if we attend to the rule laid down by the Apostle, *As Christ hath forgiven you, so also do ye.*

4. It is, therefore, a diabolical opinion, which has possessed the minds of almost all those who lay claim to gentility, that they cannot bear, even a reproachful word, without the loss of their honour and their reputation; but are under the necessity of seeking revenge in a duel, at the manifest peril of their own lives, and a plain attack upon the life of another.

This more than heathenish opinion can be refuted by many arguments:

1. We pull down the very foundation of what we are striving to build, by laying down this maxim. It is not a sign of a cowardly or ignoble mind, nor disgraceful or mean in a Christian, to bear injuries, but to inflict them. This was briefly proved above, when we were reasoning on meekness, patience, and their acts: we will now add, that this was even approved by the very heathens, especially the wiser among them. Socrates, as we find in Plato (in his

Gorgia) draws the conclusion, that every injury is dishonourable and infamous to *the inflictor* of it, not *to him who suffers it;* and that, as he says himself, *for the strongest and most solid reasons,* σιδηροῖς καὶ ἀδαμαντίνοις λόγοις. Aristotle follows the same opinion in his Ethics 5. cap. 11, giving this reason; *To inflict an injury is the effect of dishonesty; and on that account dishonourable and infamous: but to suffer one with equanimity is the effect of virtue, and therefore glorious.* Seneca, in that book where he professedly considers whether an injury can affect a wise man, writes; *We ought to despise injuries, and what I may call the shadow of injuries, contumely, whether they fall deservedly or undeservedly upon us. If deservedly, it is not contumely, but judgment given; if undeservedly, it is for him who did the injury, and not for me to be ashamed of it.* That we may not accumulate more from profane authors, we have the opinion of Christ himself, Matt. v. 11, *Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.*

2. Should we grant that injury or contumely has been cast upon us, and that to do this is criminal; nevertheless it by no means follows, that it is lawful to repel it by means of a duel: and that for these reasons;

1. No one ought to be judge in his own cause; and, least of all, one who is disturbed with anger, violence, and the passion of revenge. Tertullian, De patient. says, *What have I to do with a passion, which I cannot govern through impatience?*

2. Individuals do injury to God and his vicarious representative, the magistrate, when they seek to revenge themselves by private means. *Vengeance is mine, and I will repay,* saith the Lord, Deut. xxxii. 35; and Rom. xiii. 14, Paul says of the magistrate, *He beareth not the sword in vain.* But he would bear it in vain, if it was allowed to an individual to draw the sword at his own pleasure.

3. Duellists would punish every injury with the same punishment, namely, death; which is not the judgment of a generous man, but of a madman. Now every punishment inflicted by one possessed of all his faculties, ought to be commensurate with the offence.

We shall conclude with the saying of Christ. Matt. xxvi. 52, *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword;* that is, as Augustine interprets it, *Every one who without legitimate authority granted to him, or enjoining him so to do, shall arm himself against the life of any man, shall perish either by the sword of man, or that of Divine vengeance.* From all these reasons it appears clear, that they are absolutely madmen, who follow the opinions of the many, renouncing the doctrine of Christ: so that they may retain the name of Gentlemen, they do not fear the title of homicide; and, finally, so that they may avoid a suspicion of false infamy, they leap into the very pit of hell itself. Thus much of those virtues which we practise towards such persons as are hostile and injurious to us: We next come to those which refer to all without distinction.

Verse 14.

Above all these things put on charity which is the bond of perfectness.

The Apostle has exhorted the Colossians to put on meekness and long-suffering, and also to exercise these virtues: now he proceeds to advise them to put on charity also, which is the root, parent, and mistress, as well of these, as of all other virtues. This verse has two parts: the exhortation to put on charity; and the commendation of charity, which contains the force of an argument for putting it on.

Above all these things charity.] First, let us consider this virtue of charity itself; secondly, its pre-eminence, or the prerogative which belongs to it. The Apostle speaks of charity towards one's neighbour; this, however, is always to be understood to spring from love towards God. Now it is thus defined by Clemens Alexandrinus; *The extension of benevolence with just reason to the advantage of one's neighbour.* Strom. 2. But I am better pleased with the follow-

ing definition: *It is a virtue divinely infused, by which God is sincerely loved for his own sake, and one's neighbour for God's sake.* For it is the same virtue of charity, which causes us to love God, and one's neighbour under God and for God.

This love of charity is distinguished from every vicious love on account of its *beginning*. For charity flows from God, as a gift infused by the Holy Spirit into human hearts. *Love is of God,* 1 John iv. 7. *God hath given to us the Spirit of love,* 2 Tim. i. 7. Whence Prosper, De vita contempl. 3. 13, says, *Charity is a regulated will united to God, enkindled by the fire of the Holy Spirit.* But all vicious and inordinate love arises from the fountain of innate concupiscence: such is the love of the avaricious, the ambitious, the lustful; and, in one word, of all the wicked.

It is distinguished also on account of its *order and its object*. For charity arises from God whom it loves for himself: corrupt love springs from oneself. Charity proceeds to love one's neighbour for the Lord's sake; corrupt love pretends to love one's neighbour, but pursues one's own advantage and pleasure. Therefore, they neither agree in order nor in object. But when it is said, Charity proceeds from God to one's neighbour, it is by no means to be restricted to relatives, kinsmen, or our familiar friends; but is to be extended to men universally: for every man who is in want of our good offices, or our assistance, is our neighbour. Luke x. 36. Hence Augustine, on Psalm cxviii. Conc. 8, says, *Every man is neighbour to every man; nor is the remoteness of family ties to be considered, where there is a common nature.* With this view the Schoolmen say, Neighbour is to be understood not from *nearness of blood,* but *fellowship in reason.* Aquinas, Quæst. disp. de char. art. 7. But since we enlarged on this virtue of charity when treating the fourth verse of the first Chapter, we shall pass by the rest, and proceed with its pre-eminence.

The Apostle intimates this prerogative of Charity when he says, ἐπι πασι τοῦτοις, *above all these,* as the common translation renders it. In the figure the Apostle has taken up he seems to compare charity to some outward garment, which is worn over the others; to which comparison, however, we must attend not in regard to the order, as though

charity was to be put on last of all the virtues before-mentioned; but with regard to the comprehensiveness of the similitude.

1. As an outer garment is generally wider and larger than the rest; so does charity exceed the before-mentioned virtues.

2. As that garment which is worn outermost is generally more beautiful and costly than the rest; so does charity among the other virtues shine like the moon among the stars.

3. As the ranks and degrees of men are generally distinguished by the outer garment; so charity serves to discriminate the true disciples of Christ and sons of God from false and pretended ones. So John xiii. 35, *By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

Calvin reads, *on account of all these things put on charity.* The Greek word επι, signifies both *over* and *because of (super et propter);* and either way serves to illustrate the excellence of charity. For if the Apostle has commanded them on account of all these virtues also to put on charity, he wished to shew that neither they nor their actions could subsist without charity.

For first, they have their truth, and, consequently, their value, from charity; as the Apostle says, 1 Cor. xiii. 3, *Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.* Many marvellous properties are to be found in men, says Prosper, *which without having the marrow of charity, put on the appearance of piety, but have not its reality.* Epist. ad Ruffin. de lib. arbit.

Secondly, they have their actions from charity: for in those points which regard our neighbour, she is as it were the mistress of the other virtues, and causes them as her servants to perform her tasks. On this account their properties and actions are attributed to charity. *Charity is long-suffering,* &c. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, *suffereth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things;* vers. 7, ib. This is what the Schoolmen mean when they tell us that charity produces

the actions of all the other virtues, not *elicitively*, but *imperatively*.

Thirdly, they have their firmness and alacrity from charity. Whence Gregory (in cap. 28. Jobi) says, *If any work be found destitute of charity, it is immediately taken away by the tempter.* And Aquinas (Quæst. disp. de charit. art. 2) remarks, that it is the peculiar property of charity, that *in exercising the other acts of virtue, charity forces us to act voluntarily, promptly, with delight, and with firmness.* On these accounts the Apostle assigns to charity the first place among the virtues, and admonishes us to put it on either above all these or on account of them all. We come now to that encomium or eulogy of charity expressed by the Apostle in these words,

The bond of perfectness] a figurative expression. For he calls it *a bond* from the similitude of the effect, since it joins and combines together things differing from one another; and from this connexion and conjunction springs perfectness. Some refer this *perfection* to the virtues, others, to the church. The former say charity is *the bond of perfectness* among virtues themselves; since he who hath charity hath all the other virtues, and practises them; which the following Scriptures hint at; Rom. viii. 8, *He who loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law.* Galat. v. 14, *All the law is fulfilled in one word, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* Whence Cyprian says, *In love, are combined all the volumes of the Scriptures. In this all religion is consummated.* It is consequently called *the bond of perfectness,* since it joins and binds together the duties of all virtues: so that wherever true charity is, there is found the whole body and connexion as it were of all virtues. But when this sense is allowed, the Romanists fall upon us, and object;

If charity be the perfect fulfilling of the law, then does it justify: for they who perfectly fulfil the law are justified by the works of the law, yet this is impossible according to the Apostle, Rom. iii. 20.

We reply, the fulfilling of the law may be considered in a twofold sense, concerning the parts of the righteousness

commanded, and concerning the degree. True charity fulfils the law in all its parts, but not in full degree. But justification is not had from the law unless it be fulfilled in both ways; each being included in the Divine command. We add this also, That charity if it be itself perfect, brings the perfect fulfilment of the law; for if the principle that operates be imperfect in any respect, the operations flowing from it must also be imperfect. Now we have the testimony of Augustine to shew that charity is imperfect in every mortal, Eqist. 29. ad Hiero. *Entire charity exists in no individual as long as he lives here on earth: but that which is less than it ought to be, partakes of sin: from this sin there is no man free upon earth.* This also Aquinas acknowledges, Quæst. disp. de charit. art. 10.

But there are others who refer this perfection to the body of the church, and affirm that charity is the bond of perfectness in the church, since it unites her members one with another, and effects a community of mutual operations for the advantage and preservation of the whole. For as the perfection of the natural body arises from the union and connexion of the parts, so much so, that we account it halt and imperfect if they be torn away or separated: so the body of the church is considered perfect and entire, as all its members are held together by the bond of charity; but weak and imperfect if they should be drawn asunder by quarrelling and malice. In this sense, therefore, charity may be called *the bond of perfectness.* For the Apostle teaches, Rom. xii. 5, that the church is *one body;* and again, in Ephes. iv. 16, that this body *increases,* as far as it is *fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working of every part.* Nothing, therefore, prevents our admitting charity, in both respects, to be *the bond of perfectness.* These things being explained, we must point out some general corollaries or instructions which flow from the above.

1. We hence learn to examine our acts of beneficence and mercy, in order to ascertain whether they flow from charity or not. Many persons impose upon themselves, and while they are dreaming that they perform acts of cha-

rity, are doing no more than works of vanity: we must, therefore, examine as to the moving principle, the order, the object, the intention, &c.

2. We may collect from the foregoing, that with however many virtues any one may seem to be adorned, he is not clothed as becomes a son of God or a true Christian, unless he shall have put on over the rest this garment of charity.

3. Hence also we see the reason why the before-mentioned virtues, *mercy, humility, meekness, long-suffering*, and others, appear so seldom in common life; namely, because their parent *charity* has perished, as it is said in Matt. xxiv. 12, *Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.*

Hence, lastly, we perceive that they who break the bonds of charity, and afford occasion for schism, rend the integrity and perfection of their mother the Church, and, as it were, dislocate and tear her limb from limb. Thus much concerning charity.

Verse 15.

And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body: and be ye thankful.

Ye have heard the Apostle's exhortation to put on charity. He now exhorts to two other virtues, which are daughters, and, indeed, handmaids of charity; for they daily attend upon their mother, and cherish and preserve her. One of these virtues he calls *peace*, the other is *gratitude.*

As to the former, three things occur to be observed,

1. Whence this peace hath its origin: viz. from God: *the peace of God*, &c.

2. What is its office, viz. to rule and preside in human hearts: βραβευέτω.

3. What motives we have to render this duty of peace; viz. two: the ordinance of God; *to which also ye are called,* namely, by God: our mutual relation; because we are members *of the same body.*

The peace of God.] This peace is either internal, which we call peace of conscience; or external and brotherly, which we may call the peace of friendship. That former is established between God and the conscience of every individual whenever by faith he apprehends Christ, and the remission of his sins for Christ's sake, and God reconciled and propitious to him. Hence says the Apostle, Rom. v. 1, *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*: and Ephes. ii. 14, *He is our peace.* This peace cannot have its origin from any other source than God: and hence it is named *the peace of God,* Phil. iv. 7, *The peace of God which passeth all understanding,* &c. The latter subsists among neighbours, and arises from charity; and the Apostle has respect in this place principally to this. Now this peace especially denotes that affection of the heart which inclines it to love and seek concord, and to procure and preserve it by all means: although he may also design the external effect, that is, a peaceful state of all things among Christians, which is wont to arise from that peaceable inclination. This peace in either respect is also from God. That peaceable affection is by the inspiration of God; and the effect, or that happy and peaceful course of all things in the Church, is from the blessing of God. Isa. xlv. 7; and lxvi. 12; Galat. v. 22.*

Let it rule in your hearts, Βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.] Some render this, *let it bear the palm;* others more aptly (as it seems to me) *let it command, rule,* or *moderate.* For the Apostle would intimate, that this is the duty of this virtue, to act as an umpire or steward amongst the other

* The Translator is here so forcibly reminded of the beautiful and affecting Collect of our Church for the fifth Sunday after Trinity, that he cannot refrain from adducing it:—"Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by thy governance, that thy Church may joyfully serve thee in all godly quietness; through Jesus Christ our Lord." May every Reader's heart respond—"Amen."

affections: for so the word Βραβεύειν signifies. When, therefore, (as is often the case) the unruly affections of wrath, hatred, and revenge rise in our hearts, this *peace of God* ought to discharge its office, that is, put an end to the contentions, as the umpire of the games, take away the occasions thereof, compose their tumultuous affections, and restore all things to peace.

But it is also to be noted, that the Apostle does not simply direct that *the peace of God should rule,* but that it should *rule in our hearts;* in the heart, not in the mouth only, not in the countenance. For many pretend to the desire of peace in words and look, who inwardly cherish wrath and hatred: *whose words are soft, whilst war is in their heart; they are softer than oil, although they be drawn swords,* as says the Psalmist, lv. 21. Nazianzen also, Orat. 12, complains, *Peace is extolled by all, but it is followed by few.* If then this peace truly flourishes in our hearts, and performs its office, it will incline and draw all to concord, as well the offending as the offended: the offending, whilst it keeps wrathful elation from them; the offended, whilst it removes inexorable obstinacy from them: it makes the former humble, and ready to give satisfaction; the latter easy, and kind to forgive. This is the office of this steward.

To the which ye also are called in one body. He now shews what incentives we have to perform this duty of peace.

The former; Because *we are called to peace:* i. e. Because Christ our Leader and Saviour has not only by his auspices established peace between us and God; but he hath called Jews and Gentiles, and so the whole world, to cultivate peace with one another, by having called them into his Church. This is clear,

1. Because this peace is foretold in many places by all the prophets. Is. ii. 4, and xi. 6, and lxv. 12; So Mich. iv. 3; Zech. ix. 10.

2. Because this peace is enjoined upon all who are called and chosen into the family of God, that is, the Church, by the commands of God and of Christ. *Have peace one with another,* Mar. ix. 50. *Let us follow after the things which make for peace,* Rom. xiv. 19. *Endeavouring to*

keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, Ephes. iv. 3.

3. Because this peace was observed and maintained by the primitive Church with all earnestness. *The multitude that believed were of one heart and of one soul.* Acts iv. 32.

4. Lastly, this peace being violated, subverts the Church which Christ would have to be perpetual. *For a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand:* but, like as when many draw a cord in different directions, if it break, they both fall the more heavily on either hand; so when the Church is agitated by strifes, detriment and loss come upon all.

> .....*Domestic rents the people's weal disturb;*
> *Internal discords fail of peace abroad:*
> .....*For nought unsociable is firm.*
>
> Prudent. in Psychom.

Thus much of the former incitement derived from the appointment of God. But there is an additional incitement to the cultivation of peace, because not only are we called thereto by the Divine appointment, but we are moreover bound to it by a certain mystical relation, which the Apostle denotes in these words,

In one body.] They who are citizens of the same republic, are mutually called upon and bound to keep the peace; yet are they only united in one body politically: but they who are members of the Church, are united in one body supernaturally and mystically, so that they all depend upon one Head, and are quickened and informed* as it were by one Spirit. This we are taught by the Apostle, Rom. xii. 4, 5, and 1 Cor. xii. 12, 25, 26, where he infers that there ought to be no difference between the members of the same body, but the greatest harmony of spirit and sympathy.

* Omnes—vivificentur et quasi informentur ab uno Spiritu.

> ....." All alike *inform'd*
> With radiant light, as glowing ir'n with fire."
>
> *Milton.*
>
> " This sovereign arbitrary soul
> *Informs*, and moves, and animates the whole."
>
> *Blackmore.*

Now, from what hath been said concerning the origin of peace, its office, and the incentives to it, these instructions arise :

From the Author God, *the peace of God.*

1. That the peace of God rules among all those in whom the God of peace dwells : and on the other hand, they who reject this peace of God, thrust out the God of peace himself. Thus speaks the Apostle, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, *Live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you.*

2. Whatever of religion and holiness, therefore, schismatics pretend to, they promote the cause of the devil, not of God. For he is the author and the sower of discord : But the true God, is *the God of peace,* 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

3. A union, or rather a confederacy, to assail the godly, extinguish the Gospel, and disseminate errors, is not a a mark of the Church : because there is not among them the peace of God, but the peace of the devil ; such subsisted between Herod and Pilate ; such is preserved among the very devils. In vain do the Romanists, therefore, boast of this union as among the marks of their Church. These instructions are derived from the origin of peace.

From the office ; *rule in your hearts.*

1. This peaceable disposition ought to prevail in all others, and to exercise as it were a regal power over them.

1. They who are opposed to this, are to be seized, restrained, and as it were put in chains, as rebels against their king. Of this kind are wrath, envy, hatred, and the other pests of human happiness and tranquillity.

3. Let counterfeit benevolence, pretended love, hypocritical reconciliation, be far from a Christian man ; for charity and peace ought to hold the sway in his heart, not to play merely in his countenance or his words.

From the incentives ; *to the which also ye are called in one body.*

1. They who disturb the peace of the Church are unmindful of their vocation, and despisers of the Divine appointment. For they whom God hath called and gathered together into his Church, the same he commands to dwell together, as it were in unanimous brotherhood, in their paternal house.

2. However they, who are the cause and the heads of factions and dissentions, flatter themselves, and seem to themselves to be lords, they are of all men the most miserable, because they are most hateful to God. *These six things doth the Lord hate, yea, seven are an abomination to him,* Prov. vi. 16. Now Solomon puts in the seventh place, *he who soweth discord among brethren,* vers. 19.

3. He who violates peace, is not only hurtful to others, but to himself. For no member of an uniform body is injured, but it occasions detriment to the whole: Since therefore, we are all members of the same body, he who tears and injures another, does the same as if any one by his own hand should beat and wound another member of his own body.

4. They who are pleased at the discords and evils of others, are either stupid members, or indeed not at all members of this one body, the head of which is Christ, and into the society of which all the godly are called. Thus much concerning *peace.*

And be ye thankful.] This is that other virtue to which the Apostle exhorts, namely, gratitude; which Cicero called, in Orat. pro Cn. Planc. not only *the greatest of all the other virtues,* but *the mother of them.* Now this gratitude is required as well in regard to God, as in regard to men.

We ought to be thankful to God; because without gratitude there can be no spiritual blessings within us. For since every spiritual blessing depends upon a certain perpetual influx of Divine grace, ingratitude is that infernal bar which interrupts the flow and the course of the Divine goodness. Therefore we ought to be thankful, lest we should be deprived of all our gifts. But gratitude to God is joined with peace in this place, because our gratitude towards him especially appears in this, if we cultivate peace religiously; ingratitude, if we violate it. For as a mendicant and vagrant taken into a royal family, shews himself grateful, if he endeavours with all his might to adorn and defend the royal house; but on the contrary, proves himself ungrateful, if he aims to fill the same with enmities, and to rend it asunder by factions: so miserable

mortals and outcasts called and chosen into the Church (which is the house of God), render themselves grateful to God their Lord, by living in the same peacefully; but appear as ungrateful by separating and rending it in pieces with dissentions. On this account therefore, the Apostle subjoined, *And be ye thankful*, namely, towards God, by whom *ye are called into one body*.

But gratitude towards men is also required, that peace may be kept inviolate: because troubles and enmities sometimes arise, as well from kindnesses not duly repaid, as from injuries inflicted. Which we perceive in the example of Nabal, 1 Saml. xxv.; who by his ingratitude so exasperated the mind of David, that unless the prudence and humanity of Abigail had relieved him, that ungrateful man and his whole family would have been ruined. The Apostle truly thinks this the worst and most pernicious vice, which he numbers with the worst and most pernicious vices in 2 Tim. iii. 2.

Instructions;

1. If we would have God to remain kind to us, we ought to shew ourselves thankful to him, and grateful for the benefits conferred upon us.

2. The best proof that we can give of our gratitude is that we obey the Divine will. *The chief of gratitude*, says Clemens, *is to do what is agreeable to the pleasure of God.* Strom. 7.

3. Those benefitted by kindnesses, are bound by the Divine command (if occasion offers) to return thanks to their benefactors not in mere words, but in reality. We have the example of Joshua towards the harlot Rahab, Josh. vi. 23; of David towards the sons of Barzillai, 1 Kings ii. 7, &c. Therefore they are to be blamed, and scarcely to be looked upon as men, who not only neglect returning kindnesses to their friends from whom they have received benefits; but, lest they should seem to acknowledge that they owe any gratitude, load them oft-times with injuries and reproaches. Such were the men of Keilah towards David, 1 Saml. xxiii. 12. Such also was the conduct of Hanun, 2 Sam. x. 4. Such that of the Jews

towards Christ himself. So many examples of this ingratitude occur in common life, that the poet was not afraid to go so far as to say, *He whose life is preserved to him is naturally ungrateful.*

Vers. 16.

Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord.

Because it would be an endless task to exhort to particular virtues and duties of piety one by one, the Apostle would make his address compendious: This could best be done, in referring them to an absolute and perfect rule of virtue and of every duty: that he therefore does by referring them to the word of Christ.

There are two parts in this verse. In the former he excites them to the study and knowledge of the Scriptures, *Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly,* &c. In the latter, to the due use of the same, *teaching and admonishing,* &c.

Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom] In these words it is proper to observe,

1. The matter or object of our study to which we are called by the Apostle; and that is *the word of Christ,* namely, the Gospel, or the doctrine of the Scriptures. The Gospel in a certain special manner is called *the word of Christ,* because it was revealed and preached by Christ himself clothed with flesh; and because it reveals and declares to us that eternal decree of God concerning Christ our Saviour and Mediator: Luke iv. 18; Rom. i. 3. In either respect, both of author and of matter, the Gospel is called *the word of Christ.* But the whole Scripture

may also be called *the word of Christ* for the same reasons. For before his incarnation, Christ, by his Spirit, inspired the patriarchs and prophets; as it is said 2 Pet. i. 21, *The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* Yea, the Λογος itself was the eternal Son of God, who under the old Testament appeared to Moses, and instructed and established him in sacred things; as Tertullian contends, De Trin. Advers. Jud. Advers. Marcion, et alibi. Moreover, the Scriptures of the Old Testament no less than those of the New, speak and testify concerning Christ: This the Saviour asserts concerning the Old Testament, *Search the Scriptures; for they are they which testify of me,* John v. 39. Therefore, the object of this our study is the whole word of God; because the whole word of God is *the word of Christ.*

2. We must observe the mode of exercise in this study of the Scriptures: which the Apostle most fully expresses in three words:

'Ενοικείτω, *Let it dwell in you*] that is, Do not suffer the word of God, as a stranger, to stand without; but let it enter into the chamber of your heart, and constantly abide in your minds, no otherwise than as domestics dwell in the house; yea, let it be no less known and familiar to you, than they are wont to be who dwell with you.

Πλουσίως, *richly*, or *abundantly*] that is, Do not only cull some little particle, but turn over the whole Scriptures, prophets, apostles, evangelists; in a word, receive the whole doctrine revealed from heaven. Besides, admit the whole within you; into the mind, the memory, the affections, the life: in fine, let there be no part of you in which the word of God does not dwell.

'Εν πασῃ σωφια, *in all wisdom*] that is, If ye apply to the word of God, that from thence ye may seek and learn all saving wisdom; namely, perfect knowledge, as well of the things to be believed, as of those to be done, in what is ordained for life eternal. This, then, is to be the aim of our study, that we be instructed in all saving wisdom out of the storehouse of the Scriptures.

Hence we derive these instructions:

1. It is the duty of pastors to call and excite the people to the constant reading and meditation of the Scriptures: it is the duty of the people to obey such exhortations.

2. They grievously sin who excite Christian people to the knowledge of human traditions and fables; in the mean time forbidding them, as a thing full of danger, the reading of either Testament, that is, of the Divine word.

3. The word of God ought not only to be publicly preached in the temples, but to be read and heard in private houses.

4. In the word of God is contained the treasure of all wisdom necessary to salvation.

5. All, even the laics, should labour to obtain an understanding and full knowledge of Divine things.

6. That implied knowledge* which the Papists would have to be sufficient for the laity, is the offspring of laziness, the mother of impiety, not of devotion.

Therefore, the decree of the Council of Trent, and received opinion of the Papists, by which they deny that the Scriptures ought to be had in the vernacular tongue, or that the study of the Scriptures is to be required from the laity, may be refuted from this passage: nay, they affirm, that it is more safe for them to be restrained from reading the Scriptures, and is sufficient for them to regulate their course of life by the direction of their Pastors alone.†

* Vide Vol. I. p. 354, § 1.

† So Molanus, in lib. De pract. theol. tract. 3. cap. 27. conclus. 2.

The decree of the Council of Trent referred to by our author, is the one passed at the fourth session, on the Rule of Faith; from which it is evident that the unrestrained perusal of the Scriptures is regarded by the Romish Church as pregnant with danger. The fourth Rule of the "Congregation of the Index," framed upon the Spirit of the Decree, says, "It is mani- "fest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar "tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men "will cause more evil than good to arise from it."

To shew how faithfully the unchangeable Church adheres to such principles to the present time, it is deserving of notice here, that in 1816 Pope Pius VII., writing to the Archbishop of Gnezn, designates the Bible So-

But the contrary opinion (which is ours, and the same as the Apostles) we shall shew can be confirmed, the sources of our argument being indicated,

1. From the command of God, who commands the study of the Scriptures not only to the clergy but to the people, and so to all who live in the Church; Deut. xi. 18, 19.

2. From the intention of God; who would have the doctrine of salvation to be delivered in writing, to the intent that it might be accessible to all, John xx. 31, and Rom. xv. 4.

ciety a " most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined," a " pestilence," and " defilement of the faith, most imminently dangerous to souls." Leo XII. in 1824, speaking of the same institution, says that it " strolls with effrontery throughout the world, con- " temning the traditions of the holy Fathers, and, contrary to the well " known *Decree of the Council of Trent*, labours with all its might, and by " every means, to translate, or rather to pervert, the Holy Bible into the " vulgar languages of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to " be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened to some passages, " may also occur with regard to others; to wit, that by a perverse interpre- " tation, the gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or what is " still worse, into the gospel of the devil." The Irish Roman Catholic prelates, to whom this was written, publicly avowed their full concurrence with the Pope's views, and charged their flocks to surrender to the Parish priests all copies of the Scriptures received from Bible Societies, as well as all publications disseminated by the Religious Tract Society. See the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo the XIIth. pp. 16, 54—57. See also Cramp's Text Book of Popery, Chap. 3; a work which ought to be in the hands of every Protestant, especially of every Protestant Minister, in the present day.

Of the Author—John Molanus, to whom our Expositor refers on the point under consideration, little is recorded, although he was a voluminous writer. He was a Professor of Theology who flourished in the sixteenth Century at Louvain, dying in 1585, at the age of 52. He commenced his authorship by critical Notes upon the Martyrology of Usuardus, which was published at Louvain, in 1568, and soon went through seven editions. Du Pin enumerates 13 volumes or pieces of his; the one alluded to above by Davenant, being his last, and published the year of his decease. He was appointed Censor of Books by the Pope and the King, so that it is evident his abilities and exertions were in repute: but some of his pieces, especially his work De Imaginibus, prove him to have been, like many of the French writers of the Romish Church, almost a Protestant.

3. From the commendation of all those who have applied themselves to the reading of the Scriptures. The eunuch is commended Acts viii. 28; the Bereans, Acts xvii. 11: yea, all are pronounced *blessed* who become assiduous in the study of the Scriptures, Ps. i.

4. From the case of the Apostles; who, as they preached publicly the mysteries of salvation to the people, so also, by their Epistles, they recommended the whole doctrine to be read by the same. For it is most absurd for any one to say that what was heretofore written as much to the people as to the clergy, is not now proper to be read by the people. We may instance the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians.

5. From the utility and necessity of this study. By the reading of the Scriptures men are enlightened and converted, Ps. xix. 8, 9. They are directed as by the most faithful counsellors, in all the ways of life, Ps. cxix. 24. They are armed against the fiery darts of Satan, Ephes. vi.

6. From the unanimous consent of all the Fathers; who exhort the laity to the private reading of the Scriptures, and testify that the Scriptures were publicly read in ecclesiastical assemblies, not in an unknown tongue, but in a language understood by the people. Justin Martyr, Apolog. 2. ad Anton. near the end, and Tertullian in Apologet. testify, that the Scriptures were publicly read to the edification and understanding of the people. And B. Rhenanus, in Annotat. to Tertullian's book De corona militis, says, *I wish that custom could be restored to us,* &c.*

* Beatus Rhenanus, a native of Schelestat, or Slestad, in Alsace, where he was born in the year 1485. He was one of those men of learning who do not embrace any particular profession, and whose only business is to cultivate the sciences, and do service to the learned world; of the classical attainments of which he possessed a considerable share, and was likewise well skilled in Divinity. His favourite employ was correcting or explaining ecclesiastical or profane authors, several of the works of both which classes he published with notes or introductory prefaces, and which were in general much esteemed. Tertullian's treatises were the first he published, with annotations on the peculiar words and difficult phrases of that author, and prefaces to most of his pieces. But he distinguished himself most by a history of Germany, published in 1531, in 4to. and which Du Pin entitles " a

As to the private reading of the Scriptures: Jerome, ad Demetriad. de virginit. servanda; Chrysostom, Hom. 1, and 2 in Matt. and Hom. 3, de Lazaro, and Hom. 9, in Coloss.; Augustine, Enarr. in Psal. 33, and Epist. i. ad Volusian.; Damascenus, De orthod. fide, lib. 4. cap. 18.; Theodoret, De curand. Græc. affect. lib. 8, not far from the beginning; all advise it. To these I add two testimonies of Count Mirandula:* the former is drawn from the Preface to his Heptaplum; *All the Israelitish multitude, cobblers, cooks, dealers, shepherds, servants, maidens, to all whom the law was delivered to be read, could not bear the burden of the whole Mosaic wisdom.* The latter testimony is extracted from his Exposit. orat. Domin. *The Evangelical history ought to be continually read by every Christian man.*

You may see the arguments, by which Bellarmin and other Papists endeavour to take away the reading of the Scriptures from the people, refuted by Whitaker of blessed memory,† in 1 controv. De sacra Script. quæst. 2. cap. 11,

noble history." He wrote also a description of the provinces of Illyricum, and a preface to Erasmus's works. He was a particular friend of Erasmus, who entertained a high opinion of his attainments as a scholar and a critic, and of his character as a man. He died at his native place, in the communion of the Romish faith, in 1547. Yet one of his pieces, de Primatu Petri, is in the Index Libror. Prohib. of Benedict XIV., together with his Annotations on Tertullian's works. He was opposed to the Court of Rome's usurpation of temporal power.

* See Vol. i. Note †, page 354.

† Dr. William Whitaker, the justly celebrated Master of St. John's, Cambridge, at the period when our Expositor commenced his College career, and who first noticed Davenant's abilities and genius. He was a native of Lancashire, and educated at St. Paul's School, whence he proceeded to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became a Fellow. He was afterwards made Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and Chancellor of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1579; but resigned this latter preferment on being appointed Master of St. John's. He displayed his learning by Greek Translations of the English Liturgy, and of Dean Nowell's Catechism, and in his different College Theses and Lectures; but still more in his zeal for the doctrines of the Reformation, by various publications against Cardinal Bellarmin, the Jesuits Campion and Stapleton, and others. In the former it might be questioned, whether he shewed himself more the pious Christian or the learned Divine; by the latter he became esteemed as one of the most eminent Protestant Polemics of the age; proving himself extremely

and shewn to be altogether sophistical and nugatory: For from the abuse of the Scriptures, they infer that the use itself is to be denied to the people, in this manner,

1. Some of the laity, by reading the Scriptures, fall into absurd heresies; some into contempt of the Scriptures; some, either into contempt of the saints, or a pernicious imitation of them, when they read of their adulteries, lying, and things of that kind: therefore, the laity are to be restrained from the Scriptures.

If this kind of argument were good, God, Christ, and the Apostles have sinned, who would have the word of God proclaimed to all indiscriminately, notwithstanding many abused them to their hurt, 2 Pet. iii. 16. Besides, on this ground, the reading of the Scriptures should be denied equally to the clergy and the laity: for they also oftimes shamefully abuse the Scriptures. For who does not know that almost all the heresies have sprung, not from the laity and seculars, but from bishops, presbyters, and monks? We have almost as many testimonies, as names of heretics. Lastly, the argument is inconclusive; *many laics have abused the Scriptures, therefore they are to be taken away from them indiscriminately:* Let the abuse be taken away; or at least, let the Scriptures be denied to those,

well versed, and strongly armed, in all the points of the Roman Catholic Controversy. Bishop Hall was an almost enthusiastic admirer of him: "The honour of our schools (says he), and the angel of our church, learned Whitaker, than whom our age saw nothing more memorable. What clearnesse of judgment, what sweetness of style, what gravity of person, what grace of carriage was in that man! Who ever saw him without reverence? or heard him, without regard?" His works and his worth gained him renown throughout Europe; so that Cardinal Bellarmin, the champion of Popery, though often foiled by his pen, honoured his picture with a place in his Library; and said, "He was the most learned heretic he had ever read." His works were published collectively at Geneva, in 1610, in two vols. folio: but any of his pieces detached, when to be met with, are worth the purchase to a person engaged in the study of the Romish Controversy. It was Dr. Whitaker who drew up the famous Lambeth Articles, intended by Archbishop Whitgift, and several other Bishops and learned Divines assembled at Lambeth, to settle some points then strenuously controverted by one Barret, and Peter Baro. His answer to Campion is in Pope Benedict's Index Prohibit.; but none of his other works.

concerning whom it appears that they read with a perverted mind. For, as Tertullian rightly observes, lib. 1. adver. Marcion, *There is much difference between the cause and the fault, between the state and the excess. Not the institution of a good thing, but the misuse of it is to be reprobated.*

Bellarmin here adds two testimonies from the most noted of the Fathers.

One is of Basil; who checked the steward of the Emperor's kitchen, impertinently prating about dogmas of faith, with this rebuke, *It is thy business to provide porridge, not to serve up Divine eloquence.*

I answer; He did not recal him by the rebuke from the study or the reading of the Scriptures; but restrained his pride and folly, who, when he was unskilful, thought that he could teach and refute Basil, *the teacher of the world,* and determine concerning the most weighty controversies of theology. Who would not confess this was a just reproof?

The other is drawn from Jerome's epistle to Paulinus, where he thus writes:

> ..... *What is the duty of Physicians, Physicians undertake; artificers confine themselves to their work:*
>
> *The knowledge of the Scriptures is alone what all claim to themselves, The prating old woman, the drivelling old man, the wordy sophist, all presume upon, twist, teach this, before that they know it,* &c.

We answer, he does not reprehend the laity because they read the Scriptures; but blames all, of whatever rank, who presume to teach and interpret the Scriptures, and undertake as it were the theological office, when they are either altogether ignorant of the Scriptures, or have been only slightly conversant with the first principles of the same. We also confess this to be intolerable audacity. That this is the meaning of Jerome is plain, because elsewhere he commends every way the study and the reading of the Scriptures by the laity, and on this very passage of the Apostle which we have now under consideration, he thus writes; *It is here shewn that the laity ought not only to possess*

the word of Christ sufficiently, but even abundantly. These remarks concerning the first part of this verse, in which he excites to the study of the Scriptures, may suffice.

Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord.] In the preceding words he excited the Colossians to the study and knowledge of the Scriptures; now he shews the manifold use of scriptural knowledge.

1. The first use is, that Christians (even laics) should mutually teach and instruct one another in things pertaining to the faith; and what knowledge they procured to themselves from the Scriptures, they should employ to edify their brethren when needful. For although the business of teaching publicly with authority rests upon ministers; yet the duty of teaching privately out of charity, is incumbent upon every private person, to whom the faculty and the occasion is granted of edifying others in faith and religion. Thus parents are bound to teach their children, Deut. xi. 19; Psal. lxxviii. 5. This is commended in Abraham, Gen. xviii. 19. So husbands should teach their wives; *If the women will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home,* 1 Cor. xiv. 35. This, in fine, every brother should teach his brother: as we read Apollos was instructed in the doctrine of the Gospel by Aquila and Priscilla, Acts xxviii. 26. *There is an inward desire in all,* says Clemens, *of generating its own: in natural men indeed of generating men only; but in the pious and faithful of generating pious and faithful men.* Now this is done by imparting to them the doctrine of the Gospel. 1 Cor. iv. 15.

We hence learn,

1. That it behoves the laity, not only to aim at their own edification, but also their neighbour's.

2. The Papists grievously err, who scarcely permit the laics (especially those who are in a humble condition) to speak about the Scriptures, and the things pertaining to Religion; whereas Paul exhorts them mutually to *teach one another* in these things.

3. A knowledge of the Scriptures is to be employed, not out of vain ostentation, not for sophistical skirmishing,

not for ridiculous and profane trifling, but for our advantage and that of our brother. Thus much of the first use.

2. *Admonishing*, νουθετοῦντες.] This is the second use, and relates to manners. The Apostle, then, wishes that Christians imbued with the knowledge of the Scriptures, should from thence derive the rule of manners; and (when it is necessary) advise their brethren according to it, about the exercise of virtues, the avoiding of faults, and breaking off their sins. For this duty of mutual admonition and correction devolves upon all the pious. *I will teach sinners thy ways*, &c. Psal. li. 13. *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him*, Levit. xix. 17; *If any man obey not our word by this Epistle,—yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother*, 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15. They who neglect this even participate in other men's sins: For truly says Prosper, De vita contemplat. 3. 23, *I sin among all sinners, when from a certain cruel malignity of mind I do not reprove them whom I know to have sinned, or to sin.* The Schoolmen lay down many conditions of legitimate correction. In correcting or admonishing another, they require aptitude for correction, meekness in correcting, a certain knowledge of the fault, a probable hope of the amending of the offender, suitability of the time, and weight of offence. But the Scriptures require before all other things, charity and meekness in instructing and admonishing brethren. *If any one be overtaken in a fault, ye who are spiritual restore such a man in the spirit of meekness*, Gal. vi. 1. To this that rule of Augustine in Expos. epist. ad Gal. has respect: *The office of reproving another's sin is never to be undertaken, unless our conscience shall clearly answer before God, that we do it from love: for whatever you shall say with bitterness of spirit, is the attack of one who punishes, not the charity of a corrector.*

Corollaries.

1. A true Christian not only directs his own ways according to the commands of God, but, as far as in him

lies, those also of his brethren. That diabolical speech of Cain, (Gen. iv. 9) therefore, never comes into his mind; *Am I my brother's keeper?*

2. That haughtiness which is wont to bear any correction or brotherly admonition with an evil mind, is to be rejected; for it is the direct road to destruction, as Solomon forewarns, Prov. xxix. 1.

3. These mutual admonitions are more grateful to the godly and prudent, than flatteries are to fools: *He that rebuketh a man, afterwards shall find more favour than he that flattereth with the tongue,* Prov. xxviii. 23. Thus much of the other use of the Scriptures, in admonishing.

3. *In psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing,* &c.] This is the third use of the Scriptures, and regards the celebration of the Divine name, and our mutual comfort. Some join these words, *psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,* with those preceding, *teaching and admonishing one another.* But others, and with not less probability, with those following, *singing unto the Lord,* namely, *in psalms,* &c. The point is of little moment: For if they are referred to the preceding, they are not to be understood as though the materials of teaching and admonishing were to be derived from psalms and hymns alone; but the Apostle thereby wished to intimate, that even when we mean to promote hilarity, we ought to be mindful of mutual edification and utility.

As to the understanding of the words themselves: *psalms* (as it seems to Jerome) are what treat of morality, and shew what is to be done, and what avoided; *hymns,* what set forth the greatness and the majesty of God, and extol his goodness and his works; *songs* or *odes,* those which artificially unfold the harmony of the world and the order of all creatures. Beza on this passage speaks somewhat differently: he calls *psalms* whatever verses are written with various arguments (which among the Hebrews are termed *mizmorim):* he calls those *hymns,* which contain the praises of God only (which the Hebrews call *tehillim);* those *songs* or *odes,* which are peculiar and more artificial, which also embrace the same praises, but in a certain form more au-

gust than psalms or hymns (which the Hebrews call *schirim).* The Apostle would have us to entertain and promote our hilarity by these, according to that direction of St. James, v. 13, *If any be merry, let him sing psalms.* But in these psalms and hymns, or songs of believers, four conditions are required:—

1. That they must be *spiritual*] and that in a twofold respect; as well in regard to the origin, as in regard to the matter. As to the origin: like as Moses, David, and others, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, composed and sang their hymns, psalms, and songs; so we, whether we sing the same or others, ought to do it by the influence and direction of the Holy Spirit. That the psalms and hymns of the godly flow as it were from the primary author, is gathered from Ephes. v. 18, 19, *Be not drunk with wine,* says the Apostle, *but be filled with the Spirit: Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs,* &c. As though he had said, As wine is wont to excite the drunkards to foolish, silly, and lascivious airs; so does the Spirit inspire the godly to psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs. We have examples in the New Testament, of the blessed Virgin, Zacharias, and Simeon: and also in the primitive Church, certain of the holy fathers composed hymns, remains of which we retain even to this day. These psalms, hymns, and songs are also *spiritual* as to the matter: For they treat of spiritual things, relating to the glory of God and our salvation; not of secular, vain, and earthly matters. This is the first condition.

2. They must be sung with *grace.*] Some explain grace in this passage to mean *gratitude,* or *thanksgiving,* The word *grace* is sometimes taken in this sense. In 1 Cor. xv. 57, *But thanks,* χαρίς, *be to God, who giveth us the victory;* and in 2 Cor. ii. 14, *But thanks,* χαρίς, *be to God, who always causeth us to triumph in Christ.* Gratitude is not improperly joined to songs; because we are for the most part moved to sing in joyous and prosperous circumstances, in which condition the affection of gratitude is binding and plainly necessary. But others explain these words *with grace, with a certain gracious affability, which conveys both pleasure and*

utility to the hearers: so that what Horace says concerning poets, the same may be said of these spiritual songs,

They would both profit and delight.

In this same sense the word *grace*, χαρις, is sometimes taken, as afterwards in Chap. iv. vers. 6, *Let your speech be always with grace,* 'εν χαριτι; and in Ephes. iv. 29; Let your speech be such, *as shall minister grace to the hearers.*

3. They must be sung *in their hearts*] that is, from the inmost affection of the heart: for he does not exclude the voice, but advises that the affection of the heart be always joined with the voice. And rightly indeed is a certain ardent motion required in the heart itself by the Apostle: for the action of singing declares as it were the internal exultation of the heart. He therefore acts the hypocrite, who sings with the heart asleep. Hence the Royal Psalmist, when he addresses himself to sing, not only tunes his voice to the harp, but his heart in preference to either and before either. *My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed: I will sing and give praise unto the Lord. Awake up my glory; awake, psaltery and harp,* &c. Psal. lvii. 7, 8. So the blessed Virgin, Luke i. 46, 47, *My soul doth magnify the Lord; and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.* The exultation of the heart, therefore, preceded; whereupon the tongue brake forth into that divine song. Hence Bernard, in his Serm. 52 De modo bene vivendi, says, *When in the presence of God you sing psalms and hymns, revolve in your mind what you sing with your voice; do not think one thing, and sing another.*

4. They must be sung *unto the Lord*] namely, to Christ the Saviour, our God and our Lord. The songs of Christians ought not to aim at promoting dissoluteness or gain; but to be employed in celebrating the praises of Christ the Redeemer. We do not without cause celebrate Christ as true God in hymns, when the heathen are accustomed to extol their false and senseless gods, Jupiter, Neptune, Apollo, and the rest, in hymns: in this retaining, indeed, a right opinion, because they judged this spiritual worship to be rendered to the divine nature; but yet erring most perniciously in that they enrolled these monsters of men in

the calendar of gods. That there was a yearly custom of the primitive church, to sing hymns in their assemblies to Christ the Lord, is collected from that epistle of Pliny the Second to the Emperor Trajan, which is still extant, Lib. 10. epist 97, in which he writes, *that the Christians were accustomed on a particular day to meet before light, and to sing together by turns a hymn to Christ as God.* Of which epistle, and also of the manner of the Christians in worshipping Christ, Tertullian, in his Apologet, and Eusebius in Hist. eccl. lib. 3, cap. 30, make mention. But here it is proper to advise by the way, That when we assert that Christ our Lord is to be extolled in hymns, we do not exclude the Father or the Holy Spirit, nay, we call them into a participation of the same honour: for he who extols Christ the Redeemer, at the same time extols both the Father, who sent him to redeem the world; and the Holy Spirit, who renders this redemption efficacious to all the elect and believers.

Corollaries.

1. The custom of singing is useful, and is to be adopted in the assemblies of Christians, as well in public as in private. For it has (as you see) the approbation of the Apostles; and also that of the more antient Fathers; of Justin Martyr, in Quæst. a Gentibus positis, quæst. 107: of Augustine, Confess. lib. 9, cap. 6 and 7; and lib. 10, cap. 33: in which places this same seems to have been the opinion of Ambrose and Athanasius.

2. It is so to be performed, that they who hear may from thence derive spiritual pleasure and edification. Therefore, farewell to all nugatory, and much more to impure sons: farewell to the superstitious bawlings of the Papists, who bellow out psalms in their temples, but in an unintelligible language, and with so much noise and tumult, that if they should use a vernacular language, yet no one would perceive what is sung by them.

3. In singing psalms it ought to be the especial care of a Christian, that his heart be rightly affected: they who neglect this, may perhaps please men by an artificial sweetness of voice, but they will displease God by an odious

impurity of the heart. Against such, that saying of Bernard may be turned, De interiori domo, cap. 50, *You sing that you may please the people more than God: you tune the voice; tune the will: you keep the harmony of sounds, keep also the concord of manners.*

4. What things are done for cheerfulness and relaxation of the mind by Christians, ought to be of such a kind, as are agreeable to Christ and the Christian religion: we must therefore detest the madness of those who cannot be cheerful without the reproach of Christ and the ridicule of religion.

Vers. 17.

And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.

The Apostle in this verse annexes a clause to his general exhortation; in which is contained most wholesome advice, and most efficacious to regulate our life in holiness and the fear of God. But lest we should seem to follow no method in handling this verse, we shall propound two things to be considered: the matter to be regulated, or the object of the rule; and the rule itself laid down by the Apostle.

1. *Whatsoever ye do in word or deed.*] You perceive here the matter about which that rule which presently follows ought to be exercised; namely, all our words, and all our deeds: In which distribution also even the thoughts of the mind are comprehended; for there are those deeds of the inner man, no less than those which meet the senses of the outer man.

And first as to our discourse or our words, they all indeed (if we would wish to be accounted Christians) ought to be subject to a certain rule. For truly says James i. 26, *If any man seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue,*

this man's religion is vain. Hence also the Psalmist, xii. 4, attributes an unrestrained tongue to those who have cast off all fear of God; *They say, With our tongues will we prevail, our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?* Hence, lastly, it is that the tongue of the glutton is read of as being most bitterly tormented in hell; namely, because it was unwilling to be regulated and restrained in this world. For thus, observes Cyprian, Lib. 1. epist. 3, *Among all parts of the body, the mouth and the tongue of Dives endure the greatest punishment; because forsooth by his mouth and his tongue he had most sinned.* Which also Gregory remarks, Moral 1. cap. 5, *Because at feasts babbling is mostly wont to issue, the punishment indicates the guilt, when he affirms that he who feasted splendidly every day, burned most in his tongue.* It is evident, therefore, that the tongue, or our discourse, must be conformed to a rule.

Now as to the works, whether external or internal; they ought without doubt to be conformed to his rule: for if we must speak according to rule, then much more must we work. The actions of all creatures are performed according to a prescribed rule: human actions, therefore, ought much more to be subject to rule. Those axioms are known and approved by all: *Every work of nature is the work of intelligence; all nature works as if actuated by the mind of some infallible agent.* Yea, we see not only brute animals, but the very elements, perform as well as intermit all their operations at the command and the good pleasure of God their Creator. From which, as it were *á fortiori*, it is concluded, that all human actions must be directed after the rule of the Divine will. And thus much concerning the matters to be regulated; which is whatever we do, in word, or deed. Now let us consider the rule proposed in this place.

2. And it consists in two particulars. The former advises how we should conduct ourselves towards Christ; namely, so, that we do all things in his name. The latter, how to behave towards God; namely, so as to give thanks in all things to God the Father. We shall discuss these two branches of the proposed rule separately.

Do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.] That is said *to be done in the name of Christ*, which is done through his assistance, according to his command and will, and for the promotion of his glory. All these things the Scripture is wont to comprise in this form of speaking, and the Apostle in this passage seems to have wished to comprise them all. For so this phrase is every where employed, as well in the Old as in the New Testament. Thus Psal. xliv. 6, *In thy name will we tread under our enemies;* that is, by thy help. Psal. xxxi. 3, *For thy name's sake lead me*, &c. that is, for thy glory. Luke x. 17, *The devils are subject unto thy name;* that is, by thy invocation; by thy aid. Matt. xviii. 20, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name;* that is, by my command, imploring my help, for my sake, to advance my doctrine and glory. You see what it is *to do all things in the name of Christ:* Now it remains, that we briefly shew, that all things are to be thus done in the name of Christ.

As to good actions which are done immediately in reference to God and our salvation; it is certain, that nothing can either be done, or said, or thought, that is good by us, unless it be done in the name of Christ, that is, according to the will of Christ, and by the assistance and invocation of Christ, and for the glory of Christ. *I can do all things*, says the Apostle, *through Christ who strengtheneth me*, Phil. iv. 3, *We are not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves*, 2 Cor. iii. 5. Most truly said Augustine, Soliloq, cap. 24, 25, *It is not of man to wish what he can, or to effect what he may wish, or to know what he would wish or would do; but the ways of man are directed by God.* Now God governs us by Christ: we ought therefore to do all things relying upon the grace and assistance of Christ the Mediator.

This likewise is evident, That all our good actions must be referred to the glory of Christ. For if they are done with any other end, although they may seem good as to the external appearance, yet they become bad on account of the perverse intent: *For the end determines the quality in morals*, say the Schoolmen. Hence John, Revel. v. 13,

Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, &c. *heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Hither ought all our good actions to have respect; otherwise, as Augustine has well said, contra Julian, lib. 4. cap. 3, *Whatever good is done, and is not done for the end for which it ought to be done, although it seems to be good in the performance, yet the final cause itself not being the right one, it is sin.*

But also those actions which are indifferent in their nature, yet ought to be done by Christians in the name of Christ, that is (as we have explained it) according to the will of Christ, and for the glory of Christ. For although any one may eat, drink, and perform other such like actions as an animal or a man, Christ being neither invoked nor thought upon; yet he cannot do these things at all as becometh a Christian, unless by Christ.

The reasons are these;

1. We have no right to these creatures unless in Christ: therefore he is guilty of theft who, receiving things belonging to another against the will of God, takes to himself, in his own name, the creatures to his use: For *all things are ours* when *we are Christ's*, 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23. Therefore, although a civil authority is acquired by other modes; yet that evangelical authority, which gives us the faculty of using the creatures without injury to God, depends upon Christ.

2. Because, although we might have a right to the creatures without Christ; yet they are not blessed by God, nor sanctified to our use, without Christ. Therefore on this account there is need of invoking the name of Christ, and the influence of Christ with his Father. For what the Apostle says concerning meats, 1 Tim. iv. 5, *They are sanctified by the word of God and prayer*, that also is to be accommodated to all the other creatures: but the efficacy of prayer depends upon the name of Christ.

3. Because we are bound, even in things and actions indifferent in their nature, for instance, in food, and clothing, and other things of that kind, to retain that mode, and

yield to those circumstances, which accord with the Christian doctrine and profession: we ought not therefore to eat, nor drink, nor clothe our bodies, not to use relaxation and lawful pleasure, nor to labour or work in our vocation, for our own will and pleasure; but at the will and for the pleasure of our Lord Christ. He who acts in this manner, acts in the name of Christ, and for the glory of God; and he observes that Apostolic precept, *Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God:* 1 Cor. x. 31.

But here it may be asked, Whether a Christian is bound in every action expressly to implore the help of Christ, to flee to the grace and mediation of Christ, and, in fine, to regard the glory of Christ in actual thought in every business.

We answer, This actual contemplation, whether concerning the help, or the grace, or the glory of Christ, is not either possible or necessary to us for the condition of this life; but it is necessary that there be in exercise a fixed and as it were a rooted purpose in our hearts, of depending upon Christ, and referring the actions of our whole life to Christ. But we must also add, That it is the best thing, as often as it can be done, to raise our thoughts actually to Christ in all our doings: moreover it is fit and necessary, that we do that as often as the nature of the action which we undertake and transact requires it; as when the matter is of a sacred character, or of great importance to our salvation.

Instructions.

1. The vulgar are deceived whilst they judge it to be lawful to themselves to use food, clothing, speech, or any indifferent thing whatever of their own will: for all these things must be used according to rule; otherwise, although there be no evil in the thing itself, yet there will be in the person using it.

2. They who desire to maintain a right course of life, and to order their actions well, ought to have respect to Christ as to their polar-star.

3. No action is to be attempted by us to the perform-

ance of which we dare not implore the aid of Christ, and which we do not judge to be pleasing and acceptable to God for Christ's sake, at least not to be displeasing and abominable. Let the avaricious, the lustful, the drunken, and indeed all the wicked, hence judge of their actions.

4. We should not attempt even good actions relying upon our own strength, but resting upon Divine aid, and the mediation of Christ.

5. They abuse the name of Christ, who employ it for those things which tend to the reproach, not to the glory of Christ. Here the Papists sin grievously, who are wont to exercise all their superstitions, to obtrude all their errors in the name of Christ; they are not much unlike those indeed, who assume the name of Christ when they do the works of the devil. And thus much of the former part of the rule.

Giving thanks to God and the Father by him.] This is that other part of the Apostolic rule; in which we are advised how it behoves us to conduct ourselves towards God the Father. For the word *God* is to be taken personally in this place, and the word *Father* is added exegetically. Therefore *to God* and *the Father* is the same, as if he had said, to God who is the Father both of Christ and also our Father in Christ. The same form of speaking is used in Ephes. v. 30. But let us come to the point; Here are three things to be observed: 1. That we are to give thanks; 2. To whom they are to be given; 3. By whom.

1. As to the first; Thanks are to be given both in the using of the creatures and in the success and issue of all things. The enjoyment of the creatures requires thanks from us as a debt; otherwise we are inferior to the brute animals. Hence that remark of the Apostle, 1 Tim. iv. 4, *Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving.* Moreover in every success and issue of things, and every action of ours, thanks are to be given; because all things co-operate for good to those, who undertake lawful and honest things by invoking the name of Christ. On this account, in Ephes. v. 20, he more fully expresses this duty in these words, *Giving thanks to*

God always and *for all things.* Neither is this duty to be performed on our own account only; but we are bound to give thanks to God also for benefits towards our brethren, and so to the whole church. *We give thanks to God always for you,* &c. says the Apostle, 2 Thess. i. 3. It is plain, therefore, this duty of giving thanks is to be perpetual, &c.

2. To whom are thanks to be given? *To God the Father.*] It is usual in the Scriptures, to prescribe this method as well of praying as of giving thanks, that each act should be directed to the person of the Father. But there is no other reason for this, than that the Father is the fountain of Deity, from whom, as from its primary author, all good things are derived to us, by the Son's mediation, and by the Holy Spirit working the same in us. That, therefore, the order of nature and of operation may be indicated, we invoke the Father as much as possible, we give thanks expressly to the Father: yet neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit is excluded from an alliance in this honour, since the essence of the three Persons is the same. We may even add that reason also; that the name Father affords us confidence in speaking with God: for when we invoke God the Father of Christ, faith immediately conceives, the same is now also become our Father in Christ.

3. By whom? *By him;* namely *Christ.*] By Christ the Mediator, therefore, we ought both to invoke God, and give thanks after that God shall have heard us calling upon him; for our thanks will not indeed be pleasing to God, unless by Christ and for his sake. Therefore it is proper to acknowledge, that there neither hath been any merit in us for obtaining blessings from God the Father, unless by Christ; nor is there any faculty within us of giving the thanks that are due, unless by the same Christ.

Instructions.

1. They who do all things in the name of Christ, will always have copious matter for giving thanks to God, whatever things may befal them.

2. We ought to acknowledge the blessing of God in all those transactions which happen well to us, not to attri-

bute prosperous events to our own strength or counsels: for he never gives thanks with the heart, who *sacrifices to his own drag*. Hab. i. 16.

3. God the Father will not be invoked, praised, or worshipped, unless through Christ his Son and our Mediator: relying therefore upon his merit and favour with the Father, we ought to render all these our duties to God. They therefore err, who choose to themselves other Mediators to God the Father.

Thus we have explained the universal exhortation of the Apostle, which has respect to all Christians alike. Now a particular exhortation follows, which is directed to certain orders of men variously.

Vers. 18, 19.

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.
Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.

The Apostle now enters upon a particular and domestic exhortation. And since, as Aristotle has rightly observed, Polit. i. 3, *there are three alliances* (or moral relations) *of which every house is composed,* of which the husband and wife constitute the first; the parents and children, the second; the master and servants, the third: the Apostle assigns precepts to all these; but he begins with *the nuptial state,* as the first and most worthy.

But it is to be observed that he requires the duty of the wife in the first place, although the husband obtains the more worthy place in the first alliance. A twofold reason may be assigned. 1. Because it is more difficult to perform the duty of subjection than of love: for to love and delight is pleasant; but to subject oneself and obey another, is for the most part troublesome and hateful. 2. Be-

cause the affection of the husband for the most part depends on the due subjection of the wife: for if she yield her subjection, unless he is dead to all moral sensibility, he cannot but return his love. But let us come to the words of the Apostle.

We have in this eighteenth verse, 1. A proposition; 2. A limitation of the proposition. This is the proposition, *Wives ought to be subject to their husbands.* The limitation, or mode of subjection is, *As it is fit in the Lord.*

In the proposition itself we shall briefly treat these four things. First, what subjection is considered in a general point of view. Secondly, in what things this particular subjection of wives towards their husbands consists. Thirdly, what are the reasons impelling women to yield this duty of subjection. Fourthly, what may be the impediments or obstacles, that this bounden duty should not be performed by them: for both these ought to be known that they may be avoided and removed.

1. The subjection, then, of one creature to another in general, is nothing else, if it be considered on the part of God, than a Divine disposition, whereby the more imperfect are subordinate to the more perfect, that by this subjection the former may be perfected, governed, and preserved by the latter. If it be considered on the part of the creature subjected, then the virtue of subjection is its ready inclination to obey this ordinance constituted by God himself.

We see without this appointed subjection neither natural affairs, nor political societies, nay, not even the world itself could consist. All earthly and sublunary things are subject to celestial ones; for since they are in their nature more imperfect and ignoble, they cannot attain to their perfection without this natural subjection. So in political societies, government and subjection are accounted not only among the things that are useful, but among the things plainly necessary.* Hence citizens are subject to magistrates, soldiers to their commanders, for their good

* Arist. Polit. i. 3.

and advantage more than that of those to whom they are subject.

Corollaries.

1. The Author of the creatures would not have them to be confounded through *disorder*. *For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace,* 1 Cor. xiv. 33. They, therefore, are repugnant to God, who would take away the order of obeying and ruling.

2. It is not the mark of a base and abject mind, but of a generous one, and one not deviating from the law of creation, to be subject promptly and with a willing mind to his superiors. Whence that saying of the Heathen, *The government over the good is easy; every man in proportion to his depravity bears a ruler with a rude impatience.*

3. They who shake off the yoke of due subjection, are blind to their own interest: for that old adage is true, πειθαρχία ἐστὶ τοῦς εὐπραξίας μητηρ, *Obedience is the mother of prosperity.*

But we must no longer cleave to generals: let us come to the particular subjection of wives. This, then, we say consists in three things:

First, in the internal act of the heart; when the wife acknowledges in her mind, that her husband is and ought to be her head and governor, and that she is the inferior, even on the mere ground that she is a wife, although in birth, riches, virtue, and prudence, she excel her husband. This submission of the heart is the fountain of outward subjection; without this, all subjection is either forced or pretended. The Apostle seems to have had respect to this inward disposition in Ephes. v. 33, *Let the wife reverence her husband.* That pious Sarah possessed this is evident, who called Abraham her husband *lord,* not from the flattery of custom, but from the wish of testifying this subjection, 1 Pet. iii. 6.

Secondly, this subjection of the wife consists in the study of conforming her manners and affections, as much as possible, to the manners and affections of her husband in things indifferent and lawful: *For the dissimilitude of manners has no tendency to love,* says Aristotle, Oeconom. lib. i.

cap. 4. This is indeed difficult; but the more difficult it is, the more laudable; because all cherish their own manners, indulge their own affections, and hate the contrary:

The melancholy do the merry hate,
And witty minds despise the sad.

Horat. Epist. lib. i. ep. 18.

It is, therefore, laborious, to strip off as it were her own disposition, and put on another's. But this is necessary to the wife, and is before all other things to be commended in her. For as a mirror adorned with gems, and skilfully polished, is nothing, unless it express a true likeness of the person looking into it; so a wife, however endowed and beautiful, is nothing, unless she render herself conformable to the manners of her husband. This study of conforming herself to the disposition of her husband, I think the Apostle has respect to in 1 Cor. vii. 37, where he says, that the married woman *careth how she may please her husband.* She often and seriously thinks,

And turns her rapid thought, now here now there,

that she may find out the way of pleasing her husband: this is the most ready way, if she study to accommodate her manners and affections themselves, and frame them to his.

Lastly, this subjection consists in performing those duties and offices which are incumbent upon her. The first duty is, to love her husband religiously, to minister to him obligingly, and to be his help and solace in every condition of fortune: Gen. ii. 18. *Love your husbands,* says the Apostle, Tit. ii. 4. *She will do him good all the days of her life,* Prov. xxxi. 12. The duties connected with this are those of taking care of the family and children, and administering other domestic matters *according to the established laws,* as says Aristotle. On this account Paul bids wives *to love their husbands,* to be *keepers at home,* Tit. ii. 4, 5. And Plutarch relates, that the Egyptian women did not make use of shoes, that they might learn to keep at home, and be ready for domestic offices. All these things pertain to the subjection of the wife: which let it suffice to have discussed lightly: for it is not our purpose to discourse largely on each of these particulars.

3. We must now come, in the third place, to those reasons which ought to excite and impel all good and pious matrons to perform these duties of subjection.

1. The first is derived from the Divine appointment; which it is wicked for a pious mind to resist: for religious obedience does not discuss the commands of God, but performs them. But God most clearly has sanctioned this female subjection, Gen. iii. 16, *Thy desire shall be to thy husband, sub viri potestate eris,* in the Vulgate; *and he shall rule over thee.*

2. The second is derived from the natural imperfection of the woman: For by nature she is more infirm than the man, and more unsuited for her own government and protection. This both the sacred Scriptures and philosophy testify. Women are said to be *the weaker vessels,* 1 Pet. iii. 7. And Aristotle affirms, that *they have indeed the power to determine, but without authority;* and that it is the leading quality of the woman *to subserve,* not *to direct.* Polit. lib. i. cap. 8.

3. The third is derived from the order of creation. For the woman was created after the man, out of the man, and for the man. But the end for which any thing exists, is better and more noble than the thing itself. This is urged by the Apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9.

4. The fourth is derived from the transgression of the woman. For she being seduced, violated the Divine command, and allured her husband into a participation of her transgression: Now it is just, that from thenceforward the wife should hearken to her husband, because the husband was ruined by hearkening to the wife. The Apostle makes use of this argument, 1 Tim. ii. 14.

5. The fifth is derived from the disadvantage of refusing this subjection, and disturbing the Divine ordination. For as in physical things, the disturbance of natural order yields many and great disadvantages, storms, floods, and earthquakes; so by the order of the due subjection of the wife towards her husband being disturbed, brawlings and clamours are heard in the house, like thunder; their bosoms are shaken by fear and mutual suspicions, as by

earthquakes; in fine, their whole life is overwhelmed with miseries and tears, as with inundations. It would be easy to bring in more reasons; but we shall be content with these.

4, It now remains to shew, in the last place, the usual hindrances to this subjection, and in the way of advice lay down, not all, but some of the principal of those things which ought to be avoided.

1. The first is pride: which makes the wife think highly of herself and all things belonging to her, as her figure, her prudence, her family; on the other hand, to despise and disesteem her husband, as unworthy to command such a woman. To obviate this evil; 1. Let her remember, that the dignity of her husband and her own inferiority is not to be estimated from virtues, figure, nobility, or riches; but from the Divine ordination alone: The authority of the husband, and the subjection of the wife, is founded in this, which neither ought nor can be abrogated or changed from such accidental causes. 2. Let her also consider; that it is the veriest proof of folly and vanity, to presume upon her own worth and prudence: for all those things which are easily inflated are empty. 3. Lastly, let her also understand; that this motion of pride proceeds from the devil, who, as he incited Eve to eat that fruit forbidden by God by infusing this poison; so, by instilling the same poison into the daughters of Eve, he daily tampers with them to throw off the subjection prescribed by God.

2. The second is the defect of true and genuine love. For she studies not to please her husband, whose greatest displeasure is that she has got such a husband: on the other hand, true love is a perpetual monitor, and the best teacher of obedience. *Retain love,* says Augustine; *for all duties depend upon it; by it you will possess what you have learnt, and what you have not learnt.* If, therefore, love be wanting, the wife neither knows how to please her husband, nor cares about it. This evil will be avoided; 1. If parents would not compel their daughters to odious nuptials; but before they give them in marriage, to do what we read

in Gen, xxiv. 57, 58, was done to Rebecca. *Then they said, We will call the damsel, and inquire at her mouth. And they called Rebecca, and said unto her, Wilt thou go with this man? And she said, I will go.* 2. If they would beware in contracting matrimony, lest they choose husbands for the sake of honour or riches, who, they are sure, do not love them cordially. 3. Lastly, if after contracting marriage, they carefully avoid even the most trifling occasions of offence: for as things cleaving together in the beginning are rent asunder by any sudden blow; so also is it with the fresh love of those just united in marriage. But God also should be constantly invoked, that he would pour the bond of true and holy love into their bosoms: for lascivious and vague love is what arises from the flesh alone; chaste and constant love draws its origin from the Holy Spirit.

3. The third is a foolish affectation of divers vanities. For she cannot perform the domestic duties which respect her conjugal subjection, who is wholly drawn aside by the study of foibles most foreign to the office of a matron. Hither I refer that immoderate desire of appearing in public, to see, and be seen; which is ever found in connexion with a dislike of household care. From this source also springs extravagance in dress, painting the face, in short, a sort of external theatric parade in the whole tenor of life, Prov. vii. 10. They who are mad of this disease of vanity, care neither for husband, nor children, nor family. As, therefore, they would withstand this evil, let wives reflect, that they should please not the eyes of the people, but of the husband alone. For (as says Clemens, Pædag. 2.) *It is dishonest to make the beauty of the body a man-trap.* It is, as says Augustine, De doctr. Christ. 4. 21, more dishonest *to meditate by adultery of the countenance, the adultery of chastity.* If, therefore, they will study ornament, they should hear Tertullian, De cultu fæmin. *Let them borrow from simplicity, fairness of the skin, and from chastity the blush of the countenance; and let them hang in their ears the pearls of the word.* But the Apostle also recals them from these vanities to their true ornaments, in 1 Tim. ii. 9. *Let the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shame-*

facedness and sobriety, not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; &c.

As it is fit in the Lord.] These words contain either the reason of the aforesaid injunction, or rather the limitation. If the reason, they must be explained in this manner; Be subject to your own husbands, because Christ your Lord has so commanded you, whose ordination it is just that Christians should obey. But concerning this Divine ordination we have spoken. If, therefore, these words contain a limitation, (which I rather approve) then they are to be explained thus; Be subject to your husbands, not absolutely, and promiscuously in all things, but as far as God permits, or as far as it is befitting women who are *in the Lord*, that is, believers and Christians.

The occasion of this limitation springs from the circumstance, that many believing women were united to unbelieving husbands, whom they were bound to obey, so far as it could be done, without the violation of their faith and the Christian religion. For if an unbelieving husband should attempt to compel his wife to an idolatrous worship, she must resist, and be governed by that rule of Peter, Acts v. 29, *We must obey God rather than man.* There is the same reason, if the husband attempt to entice his wife into any sin: for it is not fit that those who are in the Lord, should obey in such things. The foundation of this exception is, That all authority and superiority is derived from God; and subordinate to the Divine authority: The command of the inferior power, therefore, does not oblige us to obedience when it is contrary to that of the superior, as Durandus well observes, lib. 2. dist. 39. qu. 5. That saying of Gregory, therefore, is always to be retained, *The wife should so please the will of her husband, as not to displease the will of her Creator.*

Corollaries from this limitation.

1. Wives obedient to their husbands by this due subjection, render a submission grateful to God himself; because they are subject not only for their own sake, but much more in the Lord and for the Lord's sake.

2. The wife is bound to her husband to be a companion

and help, in prosperity and adversity, in all household duties; but in no manner in sin.

3. It is the mark of imprudence and impiety, to choose such a husband as seems likely to persuade his wife to those things which are not fit in the Lord. They do this who marry Papists, or any other heretics, and wicked persons, without any difference, provided the hope of riches shine upon them from it.—And thus much concerning the subjection of the wife and its limitation.

Vers. 19. *Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.*

It is prudently said by Chrysostom, *The scales should always be equally poised in exhortations.* This Paul has accurately observed in this whole exhortation. In the foregoing verse he cast into one scale the duties of wives: now he places in the other the duties of husbands also; so that both should be equal in weight, neither the one being more than duly depressed, nor the other raised above what is meet. Therefore to come to the explication of the words: The duty of husbands is expressed in these words; by a precept enjoining *love;* by an injunction forbidding *bitterness.*

1. First we must explain the precept, *Husbands, love your wives.*] The word for *love* must be referred as well to the passion as to the effect: Which is manifestly gathered from Ephes. v. 25, where the love of Christ towards the Church is proposed for an example to husbands; *Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.* Ἠγάπησε, he *loved,* indicates the affection; Παρεδωκε, he *gave himself,* demonstrates *the effect* of the love.

In the first place, then, the Apostle requires the affection of love, namely, that the husband love his wife in

heart and mind. For this internal affection of love gives the heart itself to the thing loved, which is the most precious and first gift, and that, in fine, in which all other gifts are given when occasion requires: for love is diffusive of its good. It is not badly said by Aristotle, Rhet. 2. 8, *Love is the wishing to any one what it conceives to be good for the sake of that one, and not for its own; and it is the endeavouring to accomplish this, as far as it can.* Therefore he requires such an affection in the heart of the husband. But because we cannot thrust our eyes into the hearts of men, to see the internal affection, external effects are required in testimony of love: for the proof of love is the exhibition of its operation. Let us come to this.

The love of the husband ought chiefly to express itself in three effects.

First, it is shewn herein, that he lives freely and cheerfully with his wife in his own house; he is delighted with her presence and company; he suffers himself to be torn from her for any long time only by necessary causes, and then thinks himself to be cast elsewhere and to be thrown hither and thither, and at home with his wife to rest as in the wished-for haven. For although married persons ought to be so prepared in mind, that, if it be necessary, the one can bear absence from the other with equanimity; yet it is not to be allowed that the husband should hate or be weary of the company of his own wife, or willingly be elsewhere than with her; for true love is mostly delighted with the presence of the beloved, and is tormented as it were by the absence of the same. This effect of love we see in Christ towards his Church: for he never deserts her, or leaves her alone: but performs what he promised Matt. xxviii. 20, *I am with you always even unto the end of the world.* Thus, then, ought the husband also to be animated towards his wife, to be with her constantly unto the last breath of his life. This Solomon requires from all pious and good husbands in Prov. v. 18, 19, *Rejoice with the wife of thy youth. Let her be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times, and be thou ravished always with her love. And why wilt*

thou, my son, be ravished with a strange woman and embrace the bosom of a stranger? Yea, Aristotle himself considers it injustice in the husband, if he despise his wife, and indulge unlawful pleasures elsewhere: and he calls that undivided society of life, and due benevolence which the husband is bound to yield towards his wife, *a pious and most holy dwelling together, and dignified station of marriage.* The opinion, therefore, or rather impiety, of the Emperor Ælius Verus, is to be rejected; who is wrong in having affirmed, that the wife was a title *of dignity*, not *of pleasure:* as though wives should be satisfied that husbands condescended to honour them by contracting marriage with them; and in the mean time it might be allowed the husband to follow pleasures, or rather iniquity, out of matrimony, at his own discretion. Thus much of the first effect of love.

The second duty of love is, to direct and instruct his wife to his utmost in all those things which relate to the passing through this life well, or to the attaining eternal life. On this account the husband is called *the head of the wife* in sacred learning: that, as the body is directed by the head, so the wife should be directed by the husband to the common good of both. Aristotle writes, Oecon. l. 8, that *by a prudent husband nothing should be neglected of those things which tend to the instruction of his wife:* and he alleges the cause; namely, that she herself by being well informed may be capable of instructing her children. This also in Xenophon, in his Oeconomics, Ischomachus, whom that sweet writer proposed as an example of a good husband, as Cyrus, of a good king, says that he carefully did. Therefore he himself says, that he taught his wife, what might suffice for those cares which related to her office; and for this end, first sought from God, both that he himself might teach those things which would be best for either, and especially that she might learn the same. This duty of love (as you may perceive) was not concealed even from the heathen themselves, particularly as far as it relates to this life. But the sacred writers also extend this care of the husband to the other life: for he ought even

in the business of religion, and in those things which regard her eternal salvation, to instruct his wife. For this maxim is a sign of true love, to take care that his wife may rightly worship God together with himself in this life, whereby they may together enjoy God in the life to come. On this account, Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv. 35, refers the wife to the husband as to a domestic tutor; *If the wives would learn any thing, let them ask their own husbands at home.* Therefore the husbands ought to direct their wives in things earthly and secular; because they are co-partners in all earthly things: they ought also to instruct them in divine and heavenly things; because they are co-heirs of heavenly blessings, *heirs together of the grace of life,* as Peter says, 1 Epis. iii. 7.

The third and last effect of love is, to provide his wife with all necessary things. And in this respect it behoves the husband to imitate the care and providence of Christ: for he would have nothing wanting to his Church, which is either necessary or conducive to its welfare, as to clothing, food, and life: so the husband ought to acquire by his labour, and communicate to his wife out of love, whatever either the necessity or dignity of her person shall require. He who is not concerned about this duty, subjects himself to that heavy censure, *If any man provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel,* 1 Tim. v. 8. Hence we may conjecture what is to be thought of those monstrous guttlers, who not only provide not for their family, but dissipate the things which were well provided, in play, in drinking, and harlots; the wife and children in the mean while pinched, and all but perishing for want and hunger. Neither the love of the husband, nor the faith of the Christian appears in these things: for whom that which they are wont to allege is no excuse, that they consume what is their own; for neither Divine nor human laws permit any one to abuse his goods through lust. Besides, the wife ought to be a partaker of all the goods which belong to the husband, no less than she is compelled to be a partaker in all his ills. And thus much of the three effects of

love: which, the better to commend, we shall add a necessary caution by way of appendage.

He who is desirous of performing his duty in loving his wife, should beware of the vulgar error in choosing: Let him think from the beginning in entering upon matrimony, to choose, neither *by the eyes alone*, nor *by the fingers alone*, as Plutarch says, in Conjug. præcep.

They are said to marry *by the eyes alone*, who in choosing a wife regard chiefly her external form and beauty. That love, which rests upon so unstable a foundation, can in no way be firm and constant. Neither do I so intend this saying, as though it was unlawful to choose a modest woman from her face; (for we see the most religious and chaste patriarch Jacob to have preferred Rachel to Leah) but to be understood that external beauty is not especially, or by itself, to be sought after in marrying, but so far as it is the beauteous dress of a beauteous mind. *Virtue is more agreeable where it appears in a beautiful person*, says Virgil, Æn. lib. v. l. 344. Therefore, let the first enquiry be as to manners: If they are found to be good, and worthy of commendation, then beauty should not be slighted; which is not improperly called by Tertullian, *felicity of body, an accession to the plastic hand of the Divinity*, and *the genteel apparel of the soul*. The opinion of Solomon in this matter is to be remembered, Prov. xxxi. 30, *Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised.*

Now they are led into matrimony *by the fingers*, who only regard what the wife shall bring in money; if the dowry satisfies, they are little or not at all solicitous about probity or piety. These are worse than the before-mentioned: for they respect beauty, that is to say, the good in the person; these, money, namely, the good apart from the person. Therefore, the love of the former is light; that of the latter, plainly nothing: for they seek not a wife, but a money-porter: after that they have laid their claws upon the money, they regard not of a straw the porter. But it is the character of the pious and the wise to prefer the wife to the money, rather than the money without the wife;

and to regard that in choosing a wife, which may and ought especially to induce them constantly to love the wife. And thus we have explained to you the precept which enjoins love: Now we must proceed to the injunction, which forbids bitterness.

2. *Be not bitter against them.*] The word is a metaphor, drawn from unpleasant and bitter food, by the taste of which men are offended. By this expression therefore, the Apostle intimates, that the conversation of the husband towards his wife ought to be pleasant and kind; not unsavoury and harsh: Yea, (as says Ambrose in Hexæm. 5. 7.) although *naturally he may be rigid, yet he ought to mitigate it by the very contemplation of marriage.* Which also was the opinion of the heathen: For (as Plutarch relates) *they who did sacrifice at the rites of Juno, took out the gall of the victim, and threw it away, signifying by the ceremony, that it was not fit that bile and bitterness should enter into the married state.*

The bitterness here prohibited is wont to shew itself in three things: the affections, the words, and actions.

1. First, in the very affections of husbands. For as far as the affections are bitter, they who are exasperated against their wives for light causes, and failures however small, both begin from thence either to hate them, or at least remissly and languidly to love them. They who are affected in this manner, although they neither do nor say any thing evil against their wives, yet often render the fellowship of the conjugal state unpleasant and disagreeable. That this bitterness is to be avoided, is gathered,

1. From the precept itself of loving their wives, which is imposed upon husbands: For it does not admit that exception, If they shall be, or whilst they shall be free from all faults: For God, who gave this precept of loving the wife, knew well that no mortal is free from his faults and imperfections: Therefore by this truly impossible condition being added or understood, the precept would be superfluous (and ridiculous). As, then, the wife is bound to obey her husband, notwithstanding his many imperfections; so also the husband is bound to love his wife. If

for light causes he even remits the affection of love, it must be ascribed to bitterness.

2. This also is plain from the example of Christ, who is proposed as an example to husbands by the Apostle. For he is not wont to hate or despise his church for her many faults and sins; but he rather studies to amend and cover her sins, whilst no odium is cast upon her person: Such ought to be the affection of the husband towards his wife. No fault or sin of the wife ought then to extinguish that matrimonial affection, unless it be of that kind as to extinguish and dissolve matrimony itself: for the wife remains, whilst matrimony continues, one flesh with her husband: *But no one never hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church,* Ephes. v. 29.

3. From the confession of the very heathen. For Aristotle himself, imbued with the light of nature, saw that the husband ought not for any fault immediately to alienate his mind from his wife; but, as he says, Oecon. i. 8, he should forgive willingly *little faults,* τὰ μὲν μικρὰ τῶν πλαισμάτων, although they should be voluntary; but even if through ignorance she should offend in those which are of greater moment, he should be satisfied to have advised and instructed her, not to have hated her. And thus you see all bitterness is to be banished afar off from the very mind and affection of the husband.

2. Secondly, this bitterness seems to be placed in bitter, contumelious, or any other words opposed to conjugal love. For a tender mind is wounded no less by bitter words, than the body is by sharp weapons: Hence words are sometimes compared by the Psalmist to darts and swords. Psal. lv. It does not therefore become the husband to wound his wife by these swords. (Arist. Rhet.) As to contumelious words, they are most foreign from duty and from matrimonial love. For the design of contumely is, that one may rejoice in the disgrace of him who is treated contumeliously: but it is barbarous to rejoice in the disgrace of his own wife. But neither is that bitterness of passionate men to be suffered, which breaks out into hard words, and threats, although there may be no

intention either of contumely or injury. For if any one who is angry with any brother, and breaks forth into bitter words, *shall be guilty of hell fire*, Matt. v. 22, then how much more he who does so against his wife? Therefore, that all bitterness may be banished from the wedded state, let that precept in Prov. v. 18, be kept in remembrance: *Rejoice with the wife of thy youth:* not *strive, revile, threaten;* but *rejoice.*

3. Thirdly, Bitterness, and that the most bitter, is found in the actions; namely, when the husband, plainly unmindful what the conjugal relation is, shews himself a tyrant, and treats his wife as his servant. The very institution of marriage repels this bitterness: For God gave not Eve to Adam as a servant or a slave, but for a companion or help-meet. *Thou art not a lord, but a husband; thou hast not got a maid-servant, but a wife: God would have thee the guide of the inferior sex, not the tyrant,* says Ambrose, Hexæm. 5. 7. But this tyranny is exercised over the wife in many ways:

1. When she is removed from all domestic rule, and is degraded as it were to the rank of a maid, even perhaps subjected to one of them. But the institution of marriage, in which the wife is taken to the supreme administration of the family under her husband, opposes this. Whence Xenophon calls the wife *the guardian of the domestic laws;* and Aristotle says, that she is *to preside over the inmates.* Moreover, the sacred Scriptures assign this to her, Prov. xxxi. 27; Tit. ii. 5. Although, therefore, it ought to be pleasant to the wife to obey her husband; yet it is bitter if he compel her to be subject to his own servant, or if he do not suffer her to preside. Abraham was unwilling to be bitter in this respect against Sarah, and on that account cast out the bondmaid from his house, who began to be disobedient and troublesome to her mistress; as you may gather from Gen. xvi.

2. It is a branch also of this tyranny, when those things which pertain either to her necessity or even to her dignity are denied or taken away by the husband. For she, by virtue of the matrimonial contract, ought to be a partner

with the husband of all his goods: It is therefore injustice if he consume on himself more than his circumstances allow, and in the mean time withdraws from his wife what is just and good. This is esteemed bitterness in the doer, and it necessarily savours of bitterness to the sufferer: *For all persons deprived of their proper privileges are deeply grieved,* says Aristotle, Œconom. i. cap. 8.

Lastly, It is the height of this bitter tyranny, to act cruelly towards the wife by stripes or blows; which we do not read that any one among the heathen did, unless he was drunk or mad. Hence the civil law permits the wife *to avail herself of a divorce, if she can prove that her husband has beaten her:* and it gives as a reason, *that blows are foreign to a state of freedom,* Cod. lib. 5. tit. 17. De repudiis; and in Novell. constit. 117. For no superiority whatever gives the power of coercing the inferior by blows. If two persons enter into a league of friendship on the condition that the younger shall obey the elder, and be directed in all things by his wisdom and discretion; he is bound to obedience by virtue of this contract: but if he refuse to do that, he cannot be forced to his duty by blows. The same must be said with regard to the matrimonial contract: for in this the husband and wife agree to a certain amicable fellowship in life, so that the wife is to be subject to her husband, and directed by him; but as a companion, not as a slave; by advice, not by stripes.*

Aristotle gives this reason; because *it is not fit to instil such fear into the wife, which may be injurious both to respect and love:* but that servile fear which is instilled by blows is subversive of both.

Neither is it fit that any one should exercise power over another by constraint supported by no law; but that power

* It is one of the glories of Christianity that it gave woman her proper place in society. Under the Jewish dispensation, woman was perpetually reminded that she was first in the transgression. In republican Athens, *man* was every thing, and woman *nothing*. In most heathen countries she is little more than a slave. It is in Christian nations she has been raised to an equality with man. It is Christianity that has conferred upon her liberty and heaven.

of chastising a wife by stripes is supported by no law either Divine or human.

Finally add, That is not to be done which cannot be done without sin, and what always derives its origin from this sin of bitterness. For although parents often chastise their children from love; yet both the experience and conscience of every one will testify, that no one proceeds to beat his wife except from anger, bitterness, or hatred; all which are unlawful things, and diametrically opposite to the matrimonial state. Therefore, let all bitterness be done away.

So far we have spoken of the duty of wife and husband. In the next place the duty of children and parents follows; among which the second domestic relation is placed.

Vers. 20.

Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well-pleasing unto the Lord.

We have said that the second domestic relation subsists between parents and children: therefore the Apostle endeavours now to imbue these with wholesome instructions in this place. And as he began in that relation ordained to be prior, from the duty of the wives; so now he begins from that of children (as I conceive) for the same reasons, or at least not much unlike. The Apostle, then, follows this order; both because children oftener fail in the duty of obedience, than parents in that of love; as because this duty of obedience rightly discharged, cannot but draw parents to the discharge of their duty. But let us come to the words.

We have in them a precept; Children, *obey your parents*, &c. and the reason of the precept; *for this is acceptable to the Lord.*

In the precept three things are to be noted: To whom it is given; Concerning what matter; and to what extent.

1. *Children*] In these words we perceive to whom this precept is proposed. The translator has rendered it, *children*. But this Greek word (τα τέκνα) is evidently of more latitude, for it denotes *young*, or *offspring* in general. It therefore extends to sons and daughters, yea, to grandchildren; for both according to the Scriptures, and according to lawyers, in the appellation of *children*, grandchildren are comprehended; as when the Jews are called *the children of Israel*, &c. Therefore, whoever is the τέκνον of another, on this very account he hath one to whom he owes honour and obedience.

Observations.

1. No age exempts a child from duty to his parents; because the indissoluble foundation of duty remains always, even in their more advanced age.

2. No dignity of office frees from this debt: For although a magistrate is on political grounds more honourable than a private person, yet a son, on the ground of having derived his origin from him, is always inferior to his father. *And Joseph went up to meet Israel his father*, &c. Gen. xlvi. 29. Therefore, whoever is a son, neither by age, nor by station, nor riches, in fine, by no mode whatever can he be exempt from this filial duty. But what is it?

2. *Obey your parents.*] Here we have the matter of the precept, namely, obedience to be rendered to parents. The Greek word ὑπακοῦετε, comprises two things; a humble promptitude in receiving the orders of another, and a cheerful obedience in executing the same. Therefore it pertains to this obedience, to do what parents order, to learn what they teach, to correct and amend what they reprove, and, in one word, to perform all outward deeds which may testify the internal affection of reverence and submission.

The Apostle could have said *Honour*, as it is said in the decalogue; but he preferred, *Obey;* namely, in order to restrain that vice under which children mostly labour. For

many yield reverence and honour to their parents, who yet fail to render obedience in the course of their life.

But we must also observe that he says, not to *fathers*, but to *parents;* for in this word both parents are included; and that properly too: for a son derives his origin from both; therefore to both, that is, both father and mother, he owes obedience and reverence. Vide Prov. xxiii. 22.

In this very word *parents*, is implied the most powerful argument, yea, many arguments, which ought to impel children to obedience. For as soon as the epithet *parents*, sounds in the ears of a child, he calls to mind that they are the persons from whom he has received his origin, his support, and education. If he has derived his origin, or his bodily existence from them, then he ought by the law of nature to be subject to them: If his food and sustenance, then he is bound to it by the moral debt of gratitude or justice. Lastly, if his instruction and discipline, then he is constrained to yield this obedience on account of his own advantage.

Instructions.

1. The desire of honouring parents is pretended in vain, where the duty of obedience is not shewn, Matt. xxi. 30.

2. He who despises his parents is not only to be reckoned to have thrown off piety, but also nature: for nature enjoins the offspring to submit to the parent; which is observed in storks, and proposed to be imitated in men by Ambrose, Hexæm. 5. 16.

3. Contumely is fixed upon God himself, when parents are not honoured: for whatever parents are, they have the likeness of God, who is the supreme Father, and from whom all paternity is derived. *Of Him is the whole family in heaven and earth*, Ephes. iii. 15. Hence Lactantius, Instit. lib. 5. cap. 19, calls God himself, our *true* and supreme *Father;* but he also adds, and earthly parents are *instruments of our existence* under God. These subordinate parents ,therefore, cannot be contemned, without God also being contemned.

4. They who strive at pleasing their parents, the same

are for the most part pious towards God: for as Hugo de St. Victor has well said, De sacram. lib. 1. cap. 7, *this paternity is to us the sign and image of the divine paternity; so that the human heart may learn by that principle which it sees, what it owes to that principle from which it is derived, and which it does not see.* Thus much concerning the matter of the precept; Now let us discuss its breadth and latitude.

3. *In all things.*] The Apostle appears to extend filial obedience to all things which are enjoined by parents, without excepting justice and equity: for universal and absolute obedience is due to God alone. But the limitation and explication of this charge may be obtained from Ephes. vi. 1, where he expresses what remains to be understood in this place; *Children, obey your parents in the Lord,* that is, as far as it is allowed by God; or, as we may gather from the words immediately following, *obey in all things,* in which, for example, this your obedience may be *pleasing to God.* For, as Aquinas has laid down, Qu. disp. de consc. art. 4, *We must not obey an inferior power against the command of a superior.* By the expression *all things,* therefore, in this place, we must understand, not all things absolutely, but all things lawful and honourable. Hence, therefore, we infer,

1. We must obey parents in things good and pious, as well in regard to the thing commanded, as to the person himself giving the command.

2. In things general and indifferent in their nature, it behoves children to obey their parents. For although the things prescribed be free and indifferent in their nature; yet obedience, when the parental command is interposed, is not at one's pleasure, but under a mandate. For truly and wisely was it said by Gerson, De relig. perfect. part. 3, *In things indifferent we must especially confide in the judgment of a superior; since he tells us in the place of God what is expedient and what is proper.*

3. Although the injunctions of parents may seem harsh and unjust, yet if they contain nothing of impiety they must be obeyed, especially by children not yet set free from parental authority. We have a remarkable example

in Isaac, who withheld not his obedience to his father even unto death, Gen. xxii. 9, and in Christ himself, in his submission to his parents, Luke ii. 51.

But here a question may arise concerning married children, or those called to the administration of Church or State, whether they are still bound to obedience to parents, and how far?

We answer, That filial obedience is perpetual, and is to be rendered even to the last breath of life: which is manifest from the command itself, *Honour thy father, that thou mayest live long upon the earth.* Therefore, so long as we live here, so long is the obedience of honour due to parents; but not in the same manner and degree. Children, then, living in the paternal house, and under the paternal power, are bound to yield reverence, obedience, and assistance to their parents, and that in matters of domestic care, or in other matters according to their command and will. If parents would have them to remain at home, and aid them in household duties, they ought not to refuse; as is plain from the parable of the two sons, Matt. xxi. 28. If they wish to employ their labour to accomplish some outer business, in this also they must obey, Tob. v. 3. But as to married children, or those called to administer the Church or State, the case is different. For although all these are yet bound to revere, obey, and even to render assistance when occasion offers; yet they are not bound, as before, to dwell with them, nor to labour at the domestic business of their parents; because now they have their own and more weighty business.

With respect to married children this is plain; because the husband from the Divine ordination ought to leave his father and his mother to cleave unto his wife, Gen. ii. 24. Which we must not understand abstractedly, but comparatively, and in respect of individual fellowship and cohabitation: for he ought to labour for the support of his family, Gen. xxx. 30.

Now as to those who have undertaken ecclesiastical duties; they cannot be recalled by the authority of parents to the performance of their earthly business. For if a

father cannot recal his son from the army of his earthly king by any authority with which he is invested, how much less from this sacred army? Nay, they who have put their hands to this work ought not to look back to that which they have left, Luke ix. 62.

The reason is similar in regard to those who discharge public offices: for it is just that private concerns yield to public ones. To conclude in a word: A son can never be freed from the duty of honouring and succouring his parents; but he may from the duty of dwelling with them, and administering their domestic affairs. And so far respecting the precept itself.

For this is well pleasing unto the Lord.] In these words is contained the reason or inducement, than which no other more efficacious can be presented to pious minds, to discharge that duty of obedience. For he does not say, *This your duty will be useful to you, or grateful to your parents;* but *it will be well-pleasing to Christ himself your Lord,* whom it is your happiness to please. But how does it appear that obedience towards parents is a thing so pleasing to Christ our Lord, and to God our Father?

It appears chiefly from two considerations: From even a temporal, and as it were an extraordinary reward, annexed to that command of honouring parents; which is urged by the Apostle in Ephes. vi. 2, Being *the first command with promise.* And also from temporal punishment, which is to be inflicted by the ordination of God upon the violaters of his command, which see in Deut. xxi. 18, &c. Neither was it concealed from the heathen themselves, that the life of those who conducted themselves piously and dutifully towards their parents was prolonged by the Divine gift. Whence that remark of the Greek poet; *Be assured that by honouring your parents you will flourish in the world:* and another to the same purport; *You will live long enough, if you sustain the old age of your parents.* They, therefore, acknowledge this to be *well-pleasing* to God. But they also have even declared that contempt of parents should be restrained by the severest punishments; *A wronging of parents or of the gods is to be expiated with a like judgment,*

says Valerius. Which also was agreeable to Plato; as you may see in 11 De legibus.

Instructions.

1. It behoves the faithful in every good work, especially to respect the Lord himself. If our actions are well-pleasing to him, it matters not much what men think of us, or with what mind they may receive them.

2. Children, by obeying their parents out of a pure heart, offer a service most pleasing to God himself by this their obedience, and receive a reward from him; as is clear from the example of the Rechabites, Jer. xxxv. 18.

3. He who by his contumacy provokes the anger and curse of his parents against himself, calls down the anger and the vengeance of God in like manner against him. Abimelech is an example in Judg. ix. 56.

4. Hypocrites are much deceived, who under a pretence of piety towards God, neglect the duties of piety and obedience towards parents: as though sacrifice was more pleasing to God than either obedience or mercy. But Christ most clearly refutes this error, in Matt. xv. 4, 5, &c. The Papists have renewed this error of the Pharisees by maintaining, That it is lawful for children, even in opposition to their parents, to profess religion, that is, to enter a monastery; which kind of life being undertaken, they cannot be subject to their parents, since they are bound by a Divine and natural law. Let us see therefore, what they think of this matter; and what we must think according to the word of God.

Aquinas, Q. 2. qu. 88. art. 9, concludes, *after the years of puberty, children may bind themselves by a religious vow without the consent of their parents.* This is also the common opinion of the Papists, and is defended by Bellarmin in lib. 2. De monachis, cap. 36, where he thus decides, *That it is lawful for children, against the will of their parents, to leave their home, and enter upon a monastic life, provided they shall have reached the years of puberty, and the parents are not in such poverty but that they may live without their help.* It is decided that boys shall be accounted of the age at fourteen; girls, at twelve. But on the contrary, we

shall prove that it is not lawful that this should be done against the will of the parents. For;

1. To do any thing whatever not commanded by God, but in manifest violation of a command, is impious and rash: But for any one to bind himself to a monastic life does not come under the Divine precept; and to resist parents, when they enjoin that upon us which is either good or is not unlawful, is a manifest violation of a Divine command: Since, therefore, it is good and lawful to profit their parents, and to serve them in their domestic cares, children, whilst not yet free, ought not to desert their parents against their will.

2. To offer to God what is another's, and that against his will, is opposed to virtue: But the power over children belongs to parents, whilst they are under their keeping, so that they cannot of their own will withdraw themselves from their parents, and betake themselves whither they wish: therefore they cannot vow to enter a monastery against the will of their parents. Hither applies that declaration in Numb. xxx. 3, 5, *If a woman shall have vowed in her father's house in her youth; if her father shall have disallowed her, her vow shall be void.*

Neither is that reply of Bellarmin and Aquinas of any weight, who say, that before the years of puberty, i. e. (as they interpret it) before the twelfth year, a damsel cannot vow against the consent of her parents: but afterwards she may, because she is free in all those things which relate to her person: for the context opposes it; which enacts this law concerning every woman remaining in her father's house, that is, under the care of her father, whether she be twelve years old, or more.

3. What it is rash to do without the advice or not with the approbation of parents, that it is impious to do against their consent and remonstrances: But it is the part of rashness, if a youth of sixteen, or a damsel of fifteen, shall resolve about their mode of life without the knowledge and approbation of their parents, especially in entering upon that kind of life, which by a certain necessity calls them off from yielding submission to their parents; for it

is the duty of pious children, first to go to their parents, to enquire both whether they may, and whether they wish to do without their help and assistance: If, therefore, they ought not to do this without the advice of their parents, much less so against their will.

4. We have the authority of the Council of Gangra, cap. 16. tom. 1, *Whatever children separate from their parents under pretence of Divine worship, neither pay them due reverence, let them be anathema.* Bellarmin endeavours to restrict it to those alone who forsake parents that are needy, and betake themselves against their consent into monasteries. But this answer is of no weight. For first, the words of the Council are general; *Whoever separate from their parents,* without the gloss of Bellarmin, *placed in extreme want.* Secondly, it is not the part of a modest child, when he hears his parent saying that he cannot do without his assistance, and remonstrating against his proposal to enter a monastery, yet to decide in opposition to it. Lastly, it is harsh to restrict the obedience of children to the extreme poverty only of their parents.

5. Basil in Quæst, largely explained, quæst. 15, plainly asserts, *that children are not to be received into monasteries unless they shall be offered by their parents.* Bellarmin answers, that is to be understood of children under age alone; that is, males before their fourteenth year, and females before their twelfth, are not to be received without the consent of their parents; but after this age they may enter although the parents should be unwilling. But Basil does not distribute children in that place, into adults and those under age; but into *ἔρημα γονέων, καὶ ὑπὸ γονεῖς ὄντα, those who are destitute of parents, and those whose parents are yet living, and have the care of their children.* He denies that the latter are to be received without the consent of their parents.

Now let us proceed to solve the arguments of Bellarmin. He opposes it by passages of Scripture, testimonies of the Fathers, and of Councils, and by moral reasons.

1. He brings that passage of Scripture out of Gen. xii. 1, as it is in the version of the Vulgate, *Get thee out of*

thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee. Therefore it is lawful to leave parents against their will, and to enter a monastery.

I answer, In no respect does it meet the case. Abraham was now married, and his own master, not under the protection of his father; Abraham had a special command; it does not appear that Abraham's parents opposed him, nay, it appears, Gen. xi. 31, that his father consented to his journey; not, indeed, to enter a monastery, but to go into the land promised by God: But we contend respecting children still living under the paternal care, who have not a special command from God, and yet forsake their parents against their will, and betake themselves to a monastery. The cases are altogether dissimilar.

2. From Deut. xxxiii. 9, *Who said unto his father and to his mother, I know you not; and to his brethren, I am ignorant of you: these have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant.* To which he joins that passage, Matt. x. 37, *He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.*

I answer; The former passage speaks of the Levites, who drew the sword at the command of God against the idolaters, without any distinction of relationship, as you may see in Exod. xxxii. It therefore proves no more, than that they were worthy of commendation, who, to preserve the worship of God, and execute the command of God, had respect neither to relative, nor any human concern. What has this to do with those, who against the command to honour their parents, forsake them, that they may practise a superstitious worship in monasteries? That other passage does not say, *He that loveth father or mother more than cloister or hood,* but *more than Christ:* therefore it makes nothing to the point. If we cannot obey Christ and parents, then we must forsake parents: but lawful obedience is not opposed to religion, but is a religious work, and pleasing to God.

3. From Psalm xlv. 10, *Forget thy people, and thy father's house; so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty.*

Therefore, in order to serve God, it is lawful and commendable to renounce parents, and flee into a monastery.

I answer, The conclusion does not follow from these premises, unless when we cannot at the same time obey both. But these words are spoken in a literal sense concerning the daughter of Pharaoh, who could not at the same time remain in Egypt with her father, and obey her husband Solomon: they are understood in a mystical sense concerning Christ and his spouse the Church, who cannot retain her innate corruption and please Christ. But children are not compelled by this kind of necessity to enter monasteries, and desert their parents.—He brings certain other testimonies of Scripture, but so foreign to the purpose, that I am ashamed to be occupied in refuting such idle attempts: Let us come then to the Fathers whom he quotes.

1. I unite them all under one testimony, that of Theophylact, as the same answer may be accommodated to them all. Thus, then, speaks Theophylact,* on John xix. *It behoves them not to obey parents opposing piety:* and Gregory, Hom. 37, on the Evang.: *Those adversaries whom we meet in the way of God, let us know nothing of them, by hating and avoiding them:* and Augustine, Epist. 38, ad Lætum, says, that he ought to be drawn from the perfect way, neither by the command nor the entreaties of his mother.

* The Theophylact here mentioned, and who flourished in the eleventh Century, is to be distinguished from a writer and a Bishop of the Greek Church, of the same name, who lived in the seventh Century. The Father to whom reference is made as above, was Archbishop of Acris, in Bulgaria. He was a native of Constantinople, whose great reputation for Theological attainments induced Maria, the empress of Michael Ducas, to urge him to accept the See of Acris, in a province then nearly barbarous. He zealously employed himself to diffuse Christianity in his province, and wrote several works of such excellence as to rank him among the principal of the ecclesiastical writers of the period. He was living in 1071, but the exact time of his death is unknown. His principal work is "Commentaries upon the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul." He also wrote "Commentaries on the four minor Prophets." Of these works several editions have been published in Greek and Latin, and in Latin alone. His "Epistles," in number seventy-five, will be found in the Bibliotheca Patrum. From the references here made to him and others, we have some instructive specimens of the way in which the Roman Catholic advocates corrupt or pervert the Fathers.

I answer: All these are distorted by the very bad faith of Bellarmin; who, if he had looked into his authors, could not but perceive that they never even dreamt about entering monasteries against the will of parents. I approve that saying of Theophylact, namely, *That parents opposed to piety are not to be obeyed;* but, however, they must be obeyed by children when they exact the duties of piety; and this is what we maintain. The words of Gregory have respect to that saying of the Saviour, Luke xiv. 26, *If any man come to me and hate not his father and his mother, he cannot be my disciple.* Therefore, they relate equally to all Christians, not to monks alone. But Gregory in that place best interprets himself, who immediately adds these words to those which are adduced by Bellarmin: *Quasi per odium diligitur, qui carnaliter sapiens dum prava nobis ingerit, non auditur.* Gregory, therefore, means no more, than that parents, when they act wickedly towards their children, are not to be heard: which no one in his senses would deny. As to Augustine, He does not say that Lætus could enter a monastery against the will of his parents, whilst under their guardianship: nay, he no where indeed ever asserts in that epistle that he was a monk; but he shews that he was a preacher of the Gospel, and ought not to be led away by earthly cares from the office he had undertaken. *The duty,* says Augustine, *of preaching the Gospel hurries thee along; the celestial trumpet impels the soldier of Christ to the battle, whilst his mother keeps him back:* then a little after; *Thy Mother the Church, is the mother of thy mother: she requires thy just and due assistance,* &c. Therefore what Augustine urges is true, That a preacher of the Gospel ought not to be recalled from the office he has undertaken, not even by the intreaties of his mother: what Bellarmin infers, that a boy may not be prohibited from entering a monastery, not even by the command and authority of his parents, is false.

Two testimonies are cited from Jerome; one from his first Epistle to Heliodorus, in these words, *Although a grandson may hang upon his neck, although thy mother with dishevelled hair and her garments rent, may present the paps*

which sucked thee, although thy father may prostrate himself across the threshold, proceed trampling upon thy parent, and with tearless eye flee forth to the banner of the cross. It is the genius of piety alone to be cruel in this matter. It is lawful therefore for sons to follow Christ even against the will of their parents.

This Epistle, which was written by Jerome when a youth, and more of a rhetorician than a theologian, is of no great authority to determine a controversy of theology. But yet I answer; what Jerome says may be admitted, that he must fly to the standard of Christ even by trampling upon parents, if he can no otherwise get thither: yet I deny that the standard of Dominic or Francis is to be approached in this manner. I add also, that children placed under the power of their parents, may follow Christ, although they do not desert their parents. If, then, Jerome would have the standard of Christ to be found no otherwise than in a monastic life, we unhesitatingly reject Jerome as in error: if this be not his meaning, he affords nothing for confirmation to Bellarmin. And it is plain this is not his meaning: for whereas Monasteries are for the most part erected near cities and towns, Jerome calls Heliodorus into the desert, and expressly writes, *That a monk remaining in his own country cannot be perfect.* Therefore, the Papistic Monasteries should be deserts, if the opinion of Jerome is to be allowed.

I come to another testimony drawn from Jerome's epistle 47. *If any one should reproach you that you are a Christian, or that you are a virgin, and for not caring to have forsaken your mother in order to live in a monastery among virgins; you are not to regard it: such detraction is your praise, that cruelty is your piety: for you prefer him to your mother whom you are commanded to prefer to your own life.*

I answer, We do not condemn the resolution to live a virgin in those to whom the gift of continence is given by God; neither do we even blame those, who, the better to maintain this their resolution, flee as much as possible from the world, and join themselves to those who follow the same manner of life: But we deny that this virgin to

whom Jerome writes, betook herself to a monastery against the consent of her parents, or could do so without violating filial duty: upon which the hinge of the controversy turns. Jerome says, *for not caring to have forsaken your mother in order to live in a monastery;* but he does not add, *against her will and consent;* nay, he plainly asserts, that the virgin was consecrated by the will of her mother, and he exhorts her by this argument to avoid the suspected company of some young man or other, and that she would live with her mother, provided she was unwilling for her to remain in a monastery.

Ambrose, says Bellarmin, *in* 3. *De virginibus, speaking of those who profess it against the consent of their parents, does not reprove them, but their parents, who endeavoured to prevent their profession, whom he declares to be worse than Gentiles.* In proof of which he adduces these words of Ambrose; *There* (that is, among the Gentiles) *they are withdrawn from marriage by rewards; shall they be here compelled to marry by injuries? there it is made violence to take them away; shall violence be done to them here lest they enter upon it? &c.*

What Bellarmin premises of his own is false, that Ambrose spake of those virgins who offered of themselves against the will of their parents, and reproved their parents, not them. For Ambrose speaks of a certain father who had vowed the virginity of his daughter; which paternal vow when the daughter wished to fulfil, and to profess her virginity according to the ceremonies customary at that time in the church, a certain lover, by the favour of her mother (as we may conjecture) sought to marry the damsel, and hindered her profession by force. Ambrose, therefore, interposed his authority; he pronounced it not lawful for any one to compel this virgin to marry against her will, devoted to God by her father, as well as by her own consent. Therefore Bellarmin shews nothing else from this place, than that it was not lawful to compel a virgin to marry by force; which we may concede, without any injury to our defence.

Next Bernard is introduced, who in Epist. 111, thus writes in the name of Helias the monk to his parents, who desired to draw him home to them from the monastery, *God is the sole cause whereby it is not lawful to obey parents. For he declares, He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me;* &c.

I answer, It is true, We must not obey parents against the will of God: but it is false which Bernard supposes, That children cannot serve God, unless they forsake their parents and betake themselves into a monastery. And to speak freely what I think, Bernard errs most grievously in this whole Epistle, by writing as though there was no religion, no salvation, out of a monastery: since, on the contrary, every thing which really pertains to religion may be performed by any Christian whatever without becoming a monk; but many things which pertain to charity, cannot be performed by monks unless they come out from the monastery.

Bellarmin opposes to us Gregory of Tours,* who commends Leobardus and Pappula, because both against the will of their parents embraced the monastic life: therefore it is not only lawful but laudable to do this.

I answer, Gregory of Tours is not of so much authority with us, that we should admit whatever he may have praised as commendable. We therefore oppose the 16th Chapter of the Council of Gangra, where the same thing which

* St. Gregory of Tours, as he is commonly called; otherwise George Florence, a Gallic Historian and Divine; born of illustrious parentage in Auvergne, in 544. After finishing his studies under Avitus, Bishop of Clermont and successor to Gregory's Uncle Gallus, he was ordained a Deacon, and acquired celebrity as a preacher. In 573 he was chosen Bishop of Tours: and discharged the duties of his episcopate with such zeal and faithfulness, as to be looked upon as one of the greatest ornaments of the church of Tours. In 578 he was present at the Council of Paris, and he was subsequently employed as an ambassador by Gontran, king of the Burgundian Franks, and by his Nephew, Childebert II., king of Austrasia. He made a pilgrimage to Rome in 594, and died there, or after his return to his diocese, in 595. He wrote a History of France in ten Books, and eight Books of the miracles and lives of the Saints; besides other works inserted in the "Bibliotheca Patrum." It is from his Lives of the Saints most probably that the case adduced is borrowed.

was commended by Gregory of Tours, is condemned, as we have before shewn. But, in order that it may be understood how inconsiderately he has extolled this and that, we shall add what Bellarmin conceals from this same history, that Leobardus not only himself entered a monastery against the will of his parents, but against his faith pledged to a virtuous damsel to marry her; and Pappula herself, not only unknown to and against the will of her parents, but, moreover, assuming the habit of a man, entered the monastery, and carried herself in it as a man for thirty years. At the Council of Gangra, Cap. 13, an anathema was pronounced against every woman on this very account who should assume the male attire.* Away, therefore, with the commendation of Gregory, which is diametrically repugnant as well to the decree of a grave Council, as to the interdict of God himself.

* This Council of Gangra, in Paphlagonia, was held about the year 370. It was assembled in reference to the errors of one Eustathius, but a different person from the Bishop of Sebastea of that name. Under pretence of leading a more perfect and austere life, he established such practices as were considered contrary to the laws of the Church. His errors were condemned in twenty Canons drawn up by this Council. which have been placed in the Code of the Canons of the Universal (the Roman) Church. The concluding words of the Fathers of this Council are too remarkable not to be cited here, and especially as worthy of observation in the present day. They are thus given by Du Pin. "We ordain these things not to conclude those "who would, according to the advices of Holy Scripture, exercise themselves in the Church by these practices of continence and piety, but "against those who use these kinds of austerities for a pretence to satisfy "their ambition, who despise those who lead an ordinary life, and who introduce innovations contrary to Scripture and the ecclesiastical laws. We "admire virginity when it is accompanied with humility; we praise abstinence which is joined with piety and prudence; we respect that retirement which is made with humility; but we also honour marriage. We "do not blame riches when they are in the hands of persons that are just "and beneficent; we esteem those who clothe themselves modestly, without pride and affectation, and we abhor uncivil and voluptuous apparel: "We have a reverence for churches, and we approve the assemblies which "are there made as holy and useful: we do not confine piety to houses. We "honour all places built to the name of God; we approve the assemblies "which are kept in the Church for the public good. We praise the Largesses which the faithful give to the Church to be distributed among the "poor. In a word, we wish and desire that these things may be observed

In the last place, Chrysostom is cited, who in the end of lib. 3, against the censurers of a Monastic life, thus speaks to parents, *If you shall oppose it, your children, if they should be endued with distinguished virtue, although you should be unwilling they may arrive at this monastic philosophy, they will enjoy eternal pleasures; but you will heap to yourselves infinite torments.* This testimony I have deferred to the last place, because it appeared the most valid.

But I answer, It appears from that book of Chrysostom that all things at that time were most corrupt both in city and town, so that he says they deserved to have fire and brimstone rained upon them no less than Sodom and Gomorrha. Hence he takes the occasion of exhorting parents to send their young children and as yet not corrupted by the common contagion, into seclusion among the Monks, in whose schools there was somewhat of piety and the Christian Religion: not that they should be perpetually bound over and above the will of their parents, by I know not what rules, as it is now done; but that, being well grounded in piety and religion, they might reverence their parents, and be to them both a comfort and greater help through their whole life. These things being largely explained, at length he subjoins the words adduced by Bellarmin; *Your children, if they should be endued with distinguished virtue, although you should be unwilling they should arrive at this monastic philosophy,* &c. He does not say, *should become monks against your will, and wholly forsake you;* but *shall arrive at this monastic philosophy,* that is, shall learn Religion and Christian piety, which then flourished particularly among the monks. This is the meaning of

" in the Church, which we have learned from the Scripture and the Tradi-
" tion of the Apostles." Du Pin. Cent. iv. p. 268.

On the sense of this last sentence, and the proper acceptation of the term Tradition, so grossly abused by the Modern Church of Rome, the Translator would take occasion to refer his Readers to an instructive and able publication of the Rev. James Phelan, entitled, The Catholic Doctrine of Tradition as opposed to that of the Church of Rome. Dublin, 1829; and noticed in the Protestant Journal for August, 1831. The more learned Reader and Controversialist will not omit to study Archbishop Laud's Conference with Fisher the Jesuit.

Chrysostom; which will be evident to every one reading the book itself; in the whole of which not even the smallest word is found, which proves a solemn undertaking of a monastic life against the will of their parents. But if that could be proved on account of those times, in which religion and the true study of Christianity flourished mostly among the monks, it does not make for the praise of the popish Monks, among whom idleness, lust, and superstition reign; but true piety and religion are driven into exile. So much for the Fathers.

Certain Canons of the Councils are even brought forward by Bellarmin.

1. From the tenth Council of Toledo,* and the last Chapter, in which it is decreed, *that it concerns parents, not to dedicate their children to Religion sooner than their fourteenth year; but afterwards it shall be lawful for children, even against the will of their parents, to enter a monastery by their own devotion.*

I answer, We are not bound by the authority of this Council, because it is opposed by better Councils: By the third Council of Carthage,† cap. 4, in which it is ordained, that virgins are not wholly consecrated before their twenty-fifth year: and although it opposes the Council of Gangra, a Canon of which we have before cited, prohibiting children from deserting their parents by a religious pretext. Lastly, it also opposes the opinion of all the Papists, and of Bellarmin himself: For that Canon (as it

* This Council was held in the year 656. It ordained seven Canons, and its proceedings were subscribed by the Metropolitans of Toledo, Seville, and Braga, with 17 Bishops, and 5 Bishops' deputies.

† This Council, according to Du Pin, was held in the year 397, under the Consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus. It ordained 50 Canons, most of which had been passed at the Council of Hippo, in the year 393. Several of the Canons of this Council are curious and remarkable. The 18th affirms, that none shall be ordained Priest, Bishop, and Deacon, unless they have converted all those who lived in the house with them. The 26th forbids the Metropolitan to assume the title of Prince of the Priests, or the Sovereign Priest, and declares, That no other name ought to be given him but that of Bishop of the First See.—The Church, at that time, seems to have been jealous of the rise and usurpation of spiritual pride and power. Alas! how many little priests would be Sovereign priests if they could.

is extant in the edition of Surius and Binius) does not say that after the fourteenth year children may enter upon a monastic life against the will of their parents, but after the tenth year it shall be lawful for them to do it. Bellarmin saw that this was contrary to his argument, and did not square with his distinction concerning children under age and adults; therefore, in conformity with his own Jesuitical integrity, he adds four to the number.

2. He quotes from the Council of Tribur,* the 24th Canon, in these words, *If a damsel shall have assumed to herself the sacred veil of her own accord before her twelfth year,*

* This was an important Council, numerously attended, and remarkable for the character of some of its Constitutions. It was held in the year 805, under King Arnoldus, at his palace called Tribur, situated near Mentz. The Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, and Treves attended it, with nineteen German Bishops. It passed 58 Canons, several of which were confirmatory of many of those novelties and superstitions with which the Church now began to abound, and with which it was afflicted, and brought into a state of bondage issuing in the subsequent dark age. The Canon referred to above is thus stated by Du Pin: "The four and twentieth imports, that a Maid, who had taken the Veil by her own desire, and without any constraint, before she is 12 years old, is obliged to retain her virginity, if she hath worn that habit for a year and a day, and nobody may take her out of the Monastery."

The Doctors and Fathers of the Church of Rome are in the present day vehemently incensing the popular clamour against Tithes. The 13th and 14th Canons of this Council had respect to them, as existing and claimed by her in those days. After the 13th had laid down the division, and appropriation; the 14th goes on "to preserve the Tithes to the ancient Churches, and annexes the Tithes of new broken-up lands to them; but if new houses be built four miles from other Churches, in a wood, or other place, and a Church be built there by the consent of the Bishop, they may put in a Priest and give him the new Tithes." Thus was established, in this part of the Church, that system which the church of Rome had been labouring, for three preceding centuries, to establish throughout her growing empire. And we further see, from the decrees of this Council, how far Papal Supremacy had begun to extend its grasp. The thirtieth Canon appoints, "that in memory of St. Peter, the Holy Roman and Apostolic See ought to be honoured, it being just, that that Church, which is the Mother of the priestly dignity, should be the *Mistress of Ecclesiastical order*, so that 'tis fit, that men bear and endure the yoke she lays upon them, although it be almost insupportable!! Nevertheless 'tis ordered, that if any Priest or Deacon be accused of carrying forged Letters from the Pope to stir up any troubles, or lay any snares for the ministers of the Church, the Bishop may with due respect to the Pope, stop his proceedings, till he hath written to the Holy See."

her parents and tutors may make that act void if they wish. But if at a more advanced age, a youth, or a young woman, chooses to serve God (namely, in a monastic life), *it is not in the power of the parents to forbid it.* Hence Bellarmin infers, that it was lawful for children to enter a monastery after their twelfth year against the will of their parents.

I answer, the former part of the Canon is corruptly cited, the latter is forged. For that whole sentence, *But if at a more advanced age*, and what follows, are not the words of the Council, but assumed by Gratian, hence Bellarmin brings forward this Canon. For Gratian, Caus. 20, qu. 2, can. *Puella*, cites this in the same manner in which Bellarmin has done: but those last words, in which the whole force of the argument lies, are not found in the volumes of the Council themselves. Nor is this new to Gratian, whom all know to be a famous interpolater of the Councils who have compared that farrago of decrees with the councils themselves.* Bellarmin's moral reasons remain now to be solved.

1. *It is lawful for children, against the will of their parents, to contract matrimony; therefore, it is lawful for them to profess continence against their will.*

I answer, Children sin if in contracting matrimony they defer not this honour to their parents, and suffer themselves to be directed by them: and they likewise sin who desert them against their will, to lead a monastic life. Although it must be conceded, That whatever is good and pious in a monastic life may be practised by children, even if their impious and profane parents gainsay it: for instance, they may preserve perpetual continence, if they have that gift from God; they may give themselves up to prayer; they may subdue their appetite for flesh by moderate fasting; because these things are not opposed to due obedience: but they cannot withdraw themselves from the paternal roof against the will of their parents, and place themselves in that state of life in which they are un-

* Vide Note, Vol. i. p. 285.

able to assist and sustain their parents ; because this is opposed to the Divine command.

2. *It is lawful for a man, against the will of his wife, after the period of the marriage contract, to betake himself to a monastic life ; therefore it is much more lawful for a son to do that against the will of his father.*

I answer, That it is lawful by the canonical and antichristian law ; but by the Divine law it never was lawful : for matrimony, from the moment of contract, is true and confirmed matrimony, although not consummated. This very contract, therefore, transfers the power of the husband's own body to his wife, and the wife's to the husband : the husband therefore cannot against the will of the wife, defraud her of her right. What the Schoolmen pretend, that the monastic profession is a spiritual death, and that by this death marriage is dissolved no less than bodily existence, is so ridiculous, that it needs no refutation : for to die spiritually to the world and sin, is the duty of all Christians, not of the monks only.

3. *Every free-born child after the years of puberty has his own right, as far as pertains to those things which relate to his person and condition ; therefore he may use this right, and enter a monastery against the will of his parents.*

I answer, Children after the years of puberty do not immediately so become their own masters, that they may, without sin, neglect the counsel, throw off paternal rule, or slink away from home at their own pleasure. Nay, we constantly see in the Scriptures, that pious children, even after their fourteenth year (which is fixed as the mark of puberty) obey their parents, and yield to their commands, even in those things which relate to their person : as Jacob did in choosing a wife, and Isaac before him : So virgins did not take to themselves husbands without paternal approbation : Exod. xxii. 17 ; Deut. vii. 3 ; 1 Cor. vii. 36. It is therefore false, and contrary as well to Divine as to human laws, which Bellarmin takes for granted, That every damsel after her twelfth year, and every youth after his fourteenth year, may, against the will of their parents, de-

termine on these things which relate to their person and condition. And if they may, yet this should always be done with true obedience, and the honour due to parents, which compels them to forego a cloistered life.

4. *We must obey God rather than men; But God requires a perfect life in all things in general,* Matt. xix., *and in particular, by internal inspiration he calls certain persons: therefore if parents oppose, they are not to be listened to.*

Answer, Bellarmin plainly dotes, who binds perfection to a cloister and a hood. We place the perfection of a Christian life in faith and charity, not in ceremonies or monastic rules. And we say with Gerson, *That religious performances, are improperly and abusively, and perhaps arrogantly called a state of perfection.* We therefore answer to the argument, That all Christians ought to aim at spiritual perfection, neither must parents be listened to, if they endeavour to hinder the progress of their children in faith and charity: but if they direct their children to continue under their control, to remain with them at home, to obey them in domestic duties, I affirm that lawful commands of this kind cannot be contemned without the violation of the Divine command, and the work of perfection is more excellent to obey parents in the fear of God, than to subject themselves to monastic traditions.

Vers. 21.

Fathers, provoke not your children to anger; lest they be discouraged.

We have treated of the obedience of children. Now lest parents should suppose that they might do any thing they pleased by the power vested in them over their children, the Apostle would also advise even them not to abuse this their authority. And this verse consists of two parts: the former contains a prohibition; the latter, the cause of the prohibition.

Fathers, provoke not your children.] By this prohibition he would restrain the paternal power within its limits: And here let us consider the act prohibited and the persons. *Provocation* is prohibited: Now this provocation arises from a manifold abuse of paternal power.

1. If it shall have denied or withdrawn from children those things which are rightly due to them, such, for instance, as food, clothing, and education corresponding with the rank and means of their father. And this, indeed, is so heavy a sin, that the Apostle did not fear to declare, that *he who should not provide for his own, had denied the faith, and was worse than an infidel,* 1 Tim. v. 8. But neither (which is often the case) must there be sin on the other side: which they commit, who spoil their children by more dainty food, more splendid clothing, and a better education than is needful. And our age truly is more in danger from this evil, than from too much severity towards children.* That remark of Quintilian, lib. i. cap. 2, is well suited for us. *I wish we ourselves did not ruin the manners of our children. We spoil them immediately in their infancy by delicacies. That soft education which we call indulgence, destroys all the vigour both of mind and body. What will he not*

* What would Davenant have thought and said in the present day?

do when come to man's estate, who has crawled in purple in his childhood. He cannot yet utter his first words, and is already a connoisseur in colours; he already insists upon a purple dress. We form their palate before that the mouth is formed, &c.

2. Children are provoked, if parents endeavour to load them with impious and unjust commands. That was impious of Saul when he commanded Jonathan to seize and bring David his friend, guiltless of any crime, that he might be put to death, 1 Sam. xx. 31. Hence we read, vers. 34, that Jonathan was inflamed with grief and anger. That was likewise impious of Herodias, who ordered her daughter (to whom Herod had promised to give whatever she might ask) to ask the head of John the Baptist, Matt. xiv. 8. But we do not read that this dancing daughter was offended at the impious command of her mother, because she equalled her mother in impiety: if she had had any piety, she would have grieved at it. But again, I call that an unjust command, if a father, impelled by no necessity, should endeavour by his authority to compel his son to servile deeds, and unworthy of a free man. For the condition of children is one thing, that of slaves another. Among children, a father holds not a tyrannical, but a kingly rule; Therefore he ought to use their labour as a good king uses the labour of citizens, not as a master abuses the labour of servants. This Aristotle himself has noted, Polit. i. 7: and viii. 2.

3. It pertains to this provocation, when parents being seized with anger, rashly revile and wound their children when they do not deserve it, with contumelious and unbecoming language. For contumely has a certain sting, which it is very difficult for even prudent persons to endure. Saul also provoked his son Jonathan with this kind of injury, 1 Sam. xx. 30, where he breaks forth in these words, *Thou son of the perverse rebellious woman, do not I know that thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own confusion, and unto the confusion of thy mother's nakedness?* What could be said more bitter to provoke a son than that in order to reproach him he even reviles his own wife as a common prostitute?

4. Children are provoked, when parents, out of wantonness and fury, beat and chastise them with unjust or immoderate stripes and punishments. I call that unjust chastisement, for which there is not a legitimate cause. Thus Saul even wished to strike his son with a javelin, for no other reason than that he had taken upon himself the defence of David, who was absent and innocent, 1 Sam. xx. 33, *Wherefore Jonathan arose from the table in fierce anger*, vers. 34. But chastisement is immoderate, when the severity of punishment exceeds the weight of the crime. Therefore it is provided for by Divine authority, that those who have authority over others, should not act with arbitrary cruelty towards criminals. *If the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number of stripes*, &c. Deut. xxv. 2, 3. And thus we have briefly demonstrated from what causes the provocation prohibited arises.

Corollaries.

1. Parental rule is not absolute, or unlimited; but must be conformed to nature and reason, and above all, to the Divine law.

2. It is proper to govern children with gravity and prudence: but it is not proper to exasperate them by bitterness and cruelty. For they are more likely to be kept within the bounds of duty by liberality and forbearance, than by fear and tyranny. *Fear does not keep a person long in the path of duty*, says Cicero.

3. Although it is not lawful to provoke and exasperate children, yet it is proper to instruct them, to chide them mildly, and to chastise them. That what is not expressly laid down in this place, is yet to be understood, is gathered from Ephes. vi. 4, *Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* For instruction and chastisement of offending children falls under the Divine command, and it makes for the advantage of those who are corrected. Prov. xxiii. 13, 14.

Hitherto we have considered the act prohibited. Now

let us examine in one or two words, what relates to the consideration of the persons.

Two persons are here marked out: he, or they to whom this interdict is given of not using provocation; those are *fathers:* and they concerning whom, or on whose behalf it is given; and these are the *children* of those fathers.

First, we must observe in this personal designation why the Apostle should not have retained a word which he used in the foregoing verse, when he gave the precept concerning the obedience of children: for there he speaks of *parents,* that is, of father and mother conjointly; here he speaks of *father* alone. He seems to do this, because children often offend in defect of obedience towards their mothers; therefore when he prescribes concerning obedience, it was very necessary to include mothers: but mothers seldom offend towards their children by too much severity; therefore it was sufficient to have fathers alone restrained by this interdict. For too much indulgence is the sin of mothers, not cruelty, which scarcely happens in a father, unless he is void of all paternal affection.

Secondly, it is proper to observe that argument which is implied in the term *father.* For when he says, *Fathers, provoke not,* it is as if he had said, Do not what ought to be most foreign from the person and office of a father. The very name *father,* bespeaks clemency and mildness. Hence that saying of the poet,

He was gentle, as a Father.

And here earthly fathers have before them for their imitation an example of their heavenly Father, who is never so wrath against his children, but he is mindful of his paternal clemency, as it is in Psalm lxxxix. 31, &c. *If they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail,* &c.

Thirdly, we must also notice that argument which is implied under these words, *your children.* For what else is this, than as if he had said, Afflict not your flesh, your blood, your bowels, your own selves, by any injury. For

a child is something of the father, as Aquinas says, Qu. disp. de pecc. orig. art. 8; and by the authority of Aristotle, *his own beloved.* It is therefore against the inclination of nature itself, that a father should aim to wound and provoke his own children, whom it behoves him to love and cherish.

But neither must we omit that this consideration of the persons ought also to incline the children themselves to patience and equanimity, when harshly and cruelly treated: for the cruelty of the father towards his child is a heavy sin, but the wrath and fury of a child towards his father is excessively monstrous. Hence Cicero, in his oration for Cluentius, said, that *children should not only conceal the injuries of their parents, but bear them with equanimity.* And thus far we have explained the prohibition itself: Now let us consider the cause of the prohibition.

Lest they be discouraged, or *lest they become faint-hearted.*] The cause of the prohibition is derived from the disadvantage of provocation. And its great disadvantage is shewn: for when children are treated in this manner by parents, for the most part they fall under *discouragement.*

This *discouragement,* ἀθυμία, comprises three evils: 1. That heaviness and sadness of mind into which that cruelty of their parents is wont to plunge their children, especially pious children. Hence oftentimes diseases spring, and sometimes their premature death. For *as a moth hurteth a garment, and a worm, wood; so does sadness the heart,* Prov. xxv. 20. Therefore, parents must strenuously guard against this disadvantage, lest they should seem to have begotten children only for the purpose of having persons on whom they might inflict torment. And that paternal goodness of God is to be imitated, who would have obedience shewn to himself from his children with alacrity and joy, not with sorrow and distress: The same disposition ought to prevail in earthly parents.

2. This *discouragement* comprises that dejection and stupidity of mind, which makes them fearful, and unfit to enter upon any work. For children are terrified by the cruelty of their parents, and finding that themselves and

all their duties are disagreeable and hateful to them, at length they are cast down in mind, they venture to try or attempt nothing, but they become inactive and torpid. And parents should especially beware not to sink their children to this: for children are as the hands and arms with which the old age of parents should be defended; they are the feet and legs whereby they must be sustained. Therefore as any one would deservedly be accounted mad, who should occasion such numbness to his legs and arms by any narcotic medicament, that they might become in a manner useless to him: so are those parents to be accounted not far from insane, who by their severity and cruelty, so beat and render their children stupid, that they can neither be of any help to their parents nor themselves.

3. This *discouragement* brings in its train (especially in those who are not of a very good disposition) a certain desperate contumacy. For when they perceive that all hope of pleasing is done away, they also on the other hand cast off all hope of pleasing; yea, sometimes assume to themselves a boldness in displeasing, and a wantonness of provoking their parents. This, indeed, is the height of impiety in a child; but yet the father must beware not to occasion this impiety by his cruelty. For repeated cruelty does not whet the minds of children to perform their duties, but recals and withdraws them from it. And thus much of the duty of parents.

Vers. 22, 23.

Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God:
And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.

The duties of wives and husbands, of children and parents, have been explained: There remain these of servants and masters; which being explained, nothing will be wanting that pertains to domestic instruction. He begins with servants. As to what pertains then to these, the Apostle does three things: 1. He gives a precept of obedience; 2. He teaches the mode of obeying; 3. He adds certain stimuli, or incentives to obedience, vers. 24, 25.

In the first place the precept is to be explained, which is contained in these words,

1. *Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh.*] The occasion of this precept seems to spring from the circumstance, that servants converted to Christianity, thought themselves to be exempt from the yoke of servitude. Which opinion, full of error, the devil without doubt instilled into the minds of men, that thence he might render the Christian religion odious among the heathen, as a disturber of order. This error perhaps had some colour; If masters embraced the Christian religion together with their servants, it was unjust that they should still hold them as slaves whom they were bound to account as brethren: if Masters still adhered to paganism, when their servants were converted, it seemed much more unjust that he who had been delivered and redeemed from the power of the devil, should nevertheless remain in bondage to a pagan man, who himself remained a slave to the devil. These things seemed to have an air of probability;

but notwithstanding, the Apostle gives a contrary precept; in which every word hath its weight to demonstrate the equity and even the necessity of the precept.

Servants. He addresses Christians, and yet he still calls them servants; Δουλοι.] This word does not denote such domestics as we now employ; who are in reality free and free-born, although they serve others for hire: but it denotes such as the ancients used; who were either taken in war or bought, and on that account were wholly in the power of their masters.

Concerning the foundation of this servitude, whether it be just or violent, I shall not contend: yet it appears to have been allowed and established by the law of Nations. Hence Aristotle asserts, Polit. i. 3, that servants of this kind were nothing else than ὄργανα ἔμψυχα, *certain animated instruments of their masters.* And even among the sacred writers these servants are reckoned among the goods and possessions of their masters, Job. i. 3; and the servant is called in Exod. xxi. 21, *the money* of his master. The Apostle therefore shews by this very name, that they were bound to obedience: and on that account he adds his command,

Servants, obey in all things.] This precept was proposed in these same words to children, vers. 20, and, as it was then said, involved two things; humility in receiving the commands of another, and alacrity in executing the same: for these two are intimated under this one word ὑπακουειν. But what he adds, *in all things,* that is to be restricted to things lawful and honest, and those which regard the duty of servants: for if a master shall order his servant to do any thing which is either contrary to piety or foreign from the duty of a servant, he is not bound to obey; because his master ought not to command such things. Rightly, therefore, has Jerome put in this exception, IN ALL THINGS; *namely,* says he, *in which the lord of the flesh does not command contrary to the Lord of the spirit.* Therefore, the Apostle does not include impious and unlawful obedience, when he enjoins them to obey *in all things,* but he forbids

divided and arbitrary obedience according to the will of servants themselves.

Your masters according to the flesh.] This title also, equally as the preceding one of *servants*, shews the equity of the precept. For as the epithet *servant* admonishes of the performance of obedience to another, so the name *master* points out the obedience due from him to that other. But that addition *according to the flesh*, signifies that this lordship or power of man over man, is only temporal, and in things external and temporal, but does not extend to the soul and the conscience. This difference of Divine and human authority Christ observed in Matt. x. 28, *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.*

Instructions.

1. The Christian religion does not subvert political order; nay, it does not deprive Heathen masters of their legitimate authority over Christian servants. Therefore the Anabaptists err, who think all authority to be opposed to Evangelical liberty, even of Christians over Christians.* The Papists err, who would have it that the authority of kings over their subjects is dissolved by heresy; for if notwithstanding paganism, a master remained a master of Christians according to the flesh, then a king also will remain the king of his subjects.

2. The Christian religion frees from the yoke of human servitude that which is the best and most excellent thing in man, namely, the spirit and the conscience. See Gal. v. 1. They therefore err who would rule the minds and consciences of men by virtue of any superiority and human lordship; for they are masters *according to the flesh*, not *according to the spirit*. They also err who believe or obey doctrines or commands of superiors in spiritual things pertaining to salvation, not thinking or seeking from God whether or not they proceed from their own in-

* This was a doctrine peculiar to the Anabaptists at the period of the Reformation.—Translr.

ventions. The common people among the Papists labour under this error, who yield a blind faith and obedience to their prelates, as if they were the lords of the faith of Christians. Compare 1 Pet. v. 3, and 2 Cor. i. 24.

3. Christians may and ought to submit themselves according to the flesh (i. e. in things external, doubtful, and temporal) even to the unjust commands of those who are masters *according to the flesh*. Thus Augustine, in Expos. epist. ad Rom. propos. 74, *We must not resist magistrates, although they unjustly take away from us temporal things.* And Peter, 1 epis. ii. 18, *Be subject to your masters, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.* And thus much concerning the precept and the necessity of obeying: Let us now proceed to the manner.

2. The manner of obeying is described by the Apostle, both negatively and affirmatively; Negatively, he shews the diseases of servants, from which a Christian should be free: Affirmatively, he prescribes certain precautions opposed to the aforesaid diseases.

Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers.] He touches a disease too familiar to servants, and also its cause. The disease he calls *eye-service*, i. e. obedience *under the eye*. They fall under this disease, who, when their master is present and beholding them, sedulously and strenuously perform their duty; but are idle when he is absent and knows nothing of their proceedings, and (what is worse) they waste and consume their master's substance. Such a servant is described in Luke xii. 45, who said in his lord's absence, *My lord delayeth his coming;* and thereupon exercised tyranny over his fellow servants, but he himself *eats, and drinks, and is drunken.* This is a disease which should be banished far away from Christian servants. Now he points out the cause or fountain of this disease, when he forthwith subjoins,

As men-pleasers.] He is called *a man-pleaser*, who proposes this scope or end only to himself, to be praised by men, and to please them; in the mean time being no ways solicitous whether he shall effect this by true and lawful obedience, or by counterfeit and pretended means: there-

fore, when his inspector is absent, he desists from his work. That servant who is thus resolved to please his master, has no respect in his doings for integrity of conscience, nor the advantage of his master; but then only pretends to be diligent and industrious in performing the business of his master when he perceives that it will answer his own end. Servants of this kind are like actors on the stage. For as comedians, who act in order to please, and study to please that they may thereby obtain benefit, do not mount the stage unless when the people are beholding and looking on: so these *men-pleasers* move not a hand to labour, unless when they have their masters beholding and applauding them. And thus much concerning the disease of *man-pleasing*, and its origin, namely, a fraudulent purpose of pleasing. The remedies opposed to it follow.

But with singleness of heart, fearing God.] These words have a manifest antithesis to the afore-mentioned vices. For singleness of heart is opposed to deceitful *eye-service;* the true fear of God, to the fraudulent purpose of pleasing men. Therefore, having banished those vices, he would have these contrary virtues to rule. He who serves his master to the eye, seems to have two hearts: one dutiful and pious, which excites him to due obedience in his master's presence; the other an undutiful and impious one, which impels him to idleness and fraud when his master is absent. But he who obeys *with singleness of heart*, has one heart alone, and ever the same, which moves him to perform his duty, whether his master be inspecting him or not; because he judges the chief fruit of duty is duty itself. Therefore he should be said to labour and work in *singleness of heart*, who does it having excluded deceit, hypocrisy, and all disguise of an evil intention under an honest appearance, and who desires to appear the same that he is, and to be the same that he appears. But to this simplicity he joins,

Fearing God.] As the study of deceitfully pleasing men can produce nothing else than *eye-service;* so the true and genuine fear of God always produces simplicity and sincerity. As, therefore, the cause is connected with the

effect, he places the fear of God with singleness of heart: and rightly indeed; For he who fears or respects men alone, will be changeable and inconstant in discharging any office, because he is directed by an uncertain rule: for indeed the fear of man is inconstant, inasmuch as it is incited whilst he is present, it vanishes on his being absent: but the fear of God is constant and firm in the bosoms of the pious, because God is always present to them, and never ought or can be imagined as absent. *I am a God at hand, and not a God afar off,* Jer. xxiii. 23. This was not unknown to the poet, who said, *God seeth thee being near at hand.* We have a remarkable example of the fear of God in Joseph: who, when he was solicited to commit adultery by his mistress herself whilst his master was absent and unconscious, would not hearken to her; but repelled her shamelessness by these words, *How can I do this wickedness, and sin against God?* If he had been only a *man-pleaser,* he both could and without doubt would have done it: but because he feared God the Supreme Lord, he could not wrong his earthly lord by this injury. Such are all they who obey their masters *with singleness of heart, fearing God.*

Vers. 23. *And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.*

The Apostle proceeds still in describing the manner of lawful obedience: and he adds another condition, namely, that all the duties of servants should be performed, not only *in singleness of heart* and *the fear of God,* but also *from the heart:* and he immediately subjoins the reason; namely, because they serve the *Lord,* i. e. Christ, *not men.* Let us therefore consider, first, the condition requisite in all the obedience of servants; secondly, the reason of the condition required.

Whatever ye do, do it heartily, εκ ψυχης.] Two things are implied in this one word:

1. That servants willingly and cheerfully do what things are commanded by their masters, not compulsorily and unwillingly. And, indeed, it is very probable, that certain Christian servants, obeyed their masters rather from the necessity of their condition, than from the will, especially unbelieving masters. The Apostle, therefore, endeavours to cure this evil, when he bid them to do all things, not from necessity, but *from the heart, heartily.* We do any thing *heartily,* when the mind desires and rejoices that that should be done which the hand does. On the contrary, when the mind murmurs and resists, although the outward act may be performed, yet it is done rather from the body than from the mind. For, as Prosper rightly said, *If any thing be done against the will, it is done rather for thee than that thou doest it.*

2. By this word it is also signified, that servants ought to obey their masters μετ' ἐννοίας, that is to say, not only should they be well disposed to the execution of the work, but even possess benevolence of spirit towards the commander of the work. And these for the most part are connected together; for no one performs the work imposed upon him cheerfully, except he who strives and reverences him who commanded the work. And this is expressly laid down in Ephes. vi. 7, μετ' ἐννοίας δουλεύοντες, *with good will doing service. No one obeys better than he who renders obedience from love,* says Ambrose. Thus much for the condition: Let us now come to the reason of this condition.

2. *As to the Lord, and not unto men.*] That is, as those who serve the Lord rather and more especially than men, even in such compliances as are rendered to men: for the use or utility of the works has respect to men; the mind of the doer first and especially to God. Therefore, the negative particle in this place is not used absolutely, as though it were wicked to serve men, or to respect men whilst serving them; but it is corrective and diminutive, shewing that it behoves us to regard the Lord Christ more and first in those compliances, than earthly

masters themselves. There is a well known rule in the exposition of the holy Scriptures, *In comparisons that is often denied which is not to be excluded, but only postponed to another:* as in Mar. ix. 37, *Whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me;* i. e., he rather receiveth the Father who sent me, than I who am sent; because he receiveth me by that grace. So in this place, *to the Lord, and not unto men*, i. e. to the Lord Christ, more than to men; because for the sake of Christ you serve them.

But why in these lower and external observances are they said to obey the Lord more than men, whose commands they are, and whom alone they profit?

First, because they who obey are more the servants of Christ than of earthly masters. For earthly masters buy their servants for silver and gold; Christ buys them with his precious blood: they redeem the body alone, and that for another service; Christ redeems both soul and body for perpetual liberty. They must therefore especially serve Christ.

Secondly, because they obey earthly masters only at the appointment of Christ; therefore they rather obey Christ than them; not unlike as inferior servants who obey a steward, yet are said more to obey their master, at whose will they yield to his steward: he is opposed, if he shall order the contrary to his master.

Thirdly, because Christ himself hath declared that he wishes his servants to obey their masters, and this he strictly commands in his word: and he himself also in his wise governance and by his authority, hath ordained some to service and others to dominion. Whilst faithful servants have respect to all these things, they are rightly said to *serve the Lord and not men.*

But now, that this is the most valid reason why they should do all things heartily, is gathered from hence, because this supreme Lord, that is to say, Christ, can both inspect the heart, and he is wont to regard the heart, more than the external act: It behoves the person therefore who desires to please him, to do all things *heartily.* Now let us collect the instructions in one view.

1. A Christian servant is not satisfied to please his earthly master, unless at the same time also he may please his supreme Lord, namely Christ.

2. Whatever work and external compliance may seem laudable; yet it is counterfeit and hypocritical when it is referred to a bad end.

3. In all the duties of our vocation we must study rather to preserve a good conscience, than to obtain human approbation.

4. A defect in all the observances of men towards men, arises from a defect of fear and reverence towards God.

5. They alone are judged truly to fear God, who are employed among men in a single and honest heart; on the contrary, they who carry themselves subtily and deceitfully towards men, are impious and treacherous against God.

To conclude therefore; This is the manner of Christian obedience, that a faithful man so act in all the duties of his vocation as if there was no other being in this world besides himself and God; for when he hath his eyes so fixed in every work on God, he will not dare to obtrude those compliances upon men which he knows to be odious and disagreeable to God the searcher of hearts. Thus much concerning the precept and the manner of obedience.

Vers. 24, 25.

Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for ye serve the Lord Christ:
But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.

In these two verses are contained two incentives to the aforesaid obedience, derived from those considerations by which mankind are especially moved; namely, from the reward, and the punishment: that is to say, from the pro-

mise of a reward, in the former verse; from the threat of a punishment, in the latter verse.

As to the former verse, we have in it, 1. The promise of the reward itself; *Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance.* 2. The confirmation of the reward promised; *for ye serve the Lord Christ.*

In this promise we may observe, first, the Author or Bestower of the reward promised, namely, Christ; *Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive.*

The Apostle rightly and prudently would have those servants to expect a reward from Christ. For earthly masters give food and clothing to their slaves, whether bought or taken in war: they thought not any other reward to be due to them more than to their beasts. *Food is the slave's wages,* says Aristotle, Oecon. i. 5. The Apostle, therefore, consoles these servants,* that although they are neglected by their earthly masters, yet they have a heavenly master a munificent rewarder, who will not suffer them to be destitute of a reward, if from the heart they obey their masters, and as it becomes pious men and Christians. Therefore he joins that word εἰδοτες, *knowing,* or *taking it for certain:* because it is wicked even to doubt concerning the reward which Christ himself has undertaken to bestow: for however men are accustomed to withhold and deny the reward engaged for, yet Christ neither ever will do so, nor can he. Thus much of the Author or Promiser of the reward.

Secondly, let us observe the quality of the reward signified by this addition, ἀνταποδοσιν τῆς κληρονομιας, *the reward of the inheritance.* These things seem to be incongruous: for *a reward* is paid to labourers; *an inheritance* is given to children. But the Apostle would indicate, that he is not speaking of any temporal reward, which should correspond in equal value to their work; but of that eternal reward of blessedness, which surpasses far and wide all the worth of human works or duties.

* The reader will bear in mind, that the word *servants* is used here for *slaves,* δουλοι, in conformity with the authorised version of the Bible.

This celestial reward, therefore, is called *merces, hire or wages;* not because men are able to merit it by the excellence of their works, but because it bears a resemblance to a reward in certain other circumstances.

1. As hire is not given except to labourers and workmen; so the heavenly kingdom is not given to the indolent, but to those striving in their vocation.

2. As hire is not wont to be given except after the works are finished; so life eternal is not bestowed unless after the course of this life is ended.

Now in two other respects the heavenly reward is unlike hire.

1. Hire is given according to the merit of the workman; but the heavenly reward is given from the grace and liberality of the bestower, Luke xvii. 10.

2. Hire is proportioned to the labours for which it is bestowed; but the heavenly reward hath no proportion to our services for which it is a reward; for *finite hath no proportion to infinite.* Therefore this same reward is called *an inheritance,* because it pertains to the pious and faithful by right of sonship. And by this word he comforts Christian servants: For as they could not receive any reward from their earthly masters, who looked upon them as slaves; yet they are to receive *an inheritance* from God, who accounts them as sons: and it behoves them to expect this *reward of the inheritance.*

Concerning this inheritance due to believers by right of adoption, the Apostle thus speaks in Rom. viii. 15, *Ye have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba, Father. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ;* vers. 17.

Corollaries.

1. No vocation is so mean and abject, to which a reward is not promised by God, if only men conduct themselves piously in the same. We are not, therefore, to consider how honourable our vocation may be; but labour rather, that whatever in truth it may be (so that it is lawful and honest) it may be discharged well by us, and with a good conscience. Hence that counsel of the Apostle, 1 Cor.

vii. 20, *Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called; For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's free man;* vers. 22.

2. It is not proper to fix the eyes or the mind upon those light rewards which are promised by men to those doing well; but it behoves us always to regard that eternal reward which God the Father has promised to his obedient children. Thus Paul in discharging his vocation, regards not the reward of human favour or glory, or of earthly gain, but that Crown *which the Lord shall give to all those loving his appearing,* 2 Tim. iv. 8.

3. They sin who leave off to do well, or at least act languidly and remissly, on account of the ingratitude and iniquity of men: for it is sufficient for the godly man to know that he shall receive the reward of the inheritance from Christ; with which he ought to be content, although in the mean while he is neglected and evil intreated by men.

4. They also err who attribute this reward of blessedness to their merits. For although it is given to the labourers, yet not for the excellence of their works, but by right of adoption, as was before said and proved. But now adoption excludes merit, if it be rightly defined by Lawyers. *Adoption,* says Durandus, lib. 3. dist. 10, qu. 2, *is the gratuitous taking of a person to a participation of an inheritance, to which inheritance he had no right.* And thus much concerning the promise of the reward: The confirmation of the promise follows.

For ye serve the Lord Christ.] This concerning their reward being received from Christ himself avails to confirm the hope of servants. For the work and the reward are related; Therefore, equity demands that for whom the work is done, from him the reward should be expected. It will seem scarcely credible, that they who discharged the meanest offices among men here on earth, should be said on this very account to serve Christ himself, who sits in the heavens most glorious and by no means needing human service. But the reason is manifest (as we have largely explained in the foregoing verse,) namely, that whatever

duties are performed to men according to the direction and at the command of Christ, and on account of the appointment and for the glory of Christ, they are judged to be offered and rendered to Christ himself. For *he serves God, who for the sake of God serves men*, as Jerome has rightly observed on this passage. This Christ himself shews, Matt. xxv. 40, 45, *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me; Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.* He speaks in this place concerning alms-deeds, as far as they are done or denied to men; but it ought to be extended to all the works of obedience commanded by God: for when these are rendered to men, they are rendered to God who commanded them to be done; when denied to them, they are deemed as denied to God himself. And that rightly too: for he who, being commanded by God to obey men, refuses to yield to human authority; if he had power would also shake off the Divine government.

Corollaries.

1. No service is dishonourable in which men conduct themselves well and faithfully: for they who are such, serve Christ himself, which is the height of dignity and honour.

2. No honour, no authority screens a wicked man from ignominy and disgrace: for they who are of that character serve the devil, which is the abyss of infamy and misery.

3. They who, being placed under the rule of others, are unwilling to serve, are not only rebels against men, but against God and Christ. Hence that reproof of God himself against the Israelites wishing to shake off the government of Samuel, *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me,* 1 Sam. viii. 7.

4. We ought not to obey any mortal among those who are opposed to the will of Christ: For it is unjust and foreign to reason that those should be obeyed against the will of Christ, whom we obey for Christ.

And thus much of the former incentive, derived from the promise of a reward: It remains to treat of the other, taken from the threat of punishment.

Vers. 25. *But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.*

In the foregoing verse the Apostle had encouraged servants to perform their duty properly, by proposing a reward to them: Now he stimulates them to the same duty by threatening a punishment. But there are two parts of this verse. The first contains a commination, or threatening of punishment to all who shall fail in their duty; *He that doeth wrong*, &c. The latter contains an anticipation of an implied objection, which seems to lessen the certainty of the punishment threatened; *And there is no respect of persons.*

He that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done.] Some think this punishment threatened to wicked masters for the comfort of servants: as though the Apostle had said, If your masters shall be unjust and wicked, let not your minds be dejected, do not neglect to perform for them whatever is in your power; but leave your revenge to God, who will avenge whatever injuries shall be done to you.

Imperious and impious masters are accustomed to wrong their servants in many ways. Sometimes they defraud them of their clothing, food, or due wages; Sometimes they load and urge them by labours beyond their strength; sometimes they afflict them with reproaches and unjust stripes: almost all which things happened to the people of God in the Egyptian servitude; Exod. v. For wrongs of this kind, let not servants rise against their masters through impatience or anger, or leave the tasks imposed upon them through idleness, says the Apostle. Whoever, in fine, he shall be who does these wrongs to his servant, he shall receive from God himself for the wrong which he hath done: that is, he shall feel vengeance and punishment corres-

ponding to his iniquity. We have a sample of this Divine vengeance upon the Egyptian oppressors; whom God afflicted with much heavier punishments than they were able to afflict their Israelitish servants: and upon Saul, who is punished in his posterity for the wrong done to the slaughtered Gibeonites, 2 Sam. xxi.

Other interpreters refer this commination to servants themselves: as though the Apostle had said, If the expectation of the heavenly reward cannot inflame you to fulfil your duty; this at least should excite you, that God himself will punish, either your contumacy, or your idleness. For contumacious servants, who despise their masters and regard them not of a straw, do wrong to them, as far as they do not pay them due obedience and reverence: the slothful and deceitful also are deemed to wrong their masters, because they either do not yield them due submission, or not with that faith and sincerity of heart with which they should have done. If, then, servants, by these or any other means, do wrong to their masters, they shall receive for the wrong done: that is, they shall be punished for their dishonesty by God, the judge and avenger. We have on record the example of Gehazi, 2 Kings v.

But I think with Jerome that both interpretations should be united; as well because the Apostle addresses all generally, as especially because he has placed this commination between the duties of servants and masters, that it may extend to both, and that equally. Thus, then, I explain the words of the Apostle; *He that doeth wrong;* whether he be the master, by afflicting his servant unjustly; or the servant, by despising or defrauding his master; each *shall receive for the wrong which he hath done*, that is, shall be severely punished by the Supreme Lord God according to the weight of his sin.

Instructions.

1. In all sin (although men may indulge the hope of impunity, yet) it is determined by God himself that the punishments which impend over sinners shall be inflicted. And what can it profit to have avoided the avenging hand of men, and to fall into the hands of the living God?

2. Earthly masters, with whatever power they may be armed, cannot safely or with impunity trample upon those subjected to them: for themselves also are subject to God; and *every sovereignty is under a still higher Sovereignty*, says Seneca.

3. In dealing with subjects or servants, they who are set over them ought always to consider, whether what they do is of that nature, that it may also be cleared from the charge of wrong by God the Judge: for an account must be rendered at his tribunal.

4. They are the most miserable of all mortals, who mostly afflict others by miseries: for they themselves shall receive for all those wrongs which they have done. They, therefore, doat who think themselves happy in this power of doing wrong. Thus Sylla obtained the surname of *Felix*, even because he could with impunity murder his innocent fellow citizens at will.

5. They who are under the rule and the power of others, ought to be induced by no wrongs to neglect their duty: but rather to continue at their duty, and leave their revenge to God. Thus much of the commination.

And there is no respect of persons.] There is in these words an anticipation of a lurking objection. For it might be objected on the part of masters, Who shall call us to account for evil intreating a servant? Servants were accounted as nothing. It is understood, according to the opinion of Lawyers, that no wrongs could be done to servants. But suppose that we are arraigned; we shall either escape through favour, or we shall avoid it by power, or we shall bribe the judge himself by money. The Apostle meets these notions; and affirms, that the rule of Divine and of human justice is not the same. Human tribunals are very much like a spider's web: they enfold the powerless and weak; but the mighty and the rich break through by main force. But that Supreme Judge is not terrified by power, nor turned aside by favour, nor bribed by the money of the wicked: there is at his tribunal *no respect of persons*. This is well depicted by Job, xxxiv. 19, *He accepteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the*

rich more than the poor: for they all are the work of his hands. Upon this passage Ambrose writes in Ephes. vi. *The Lord is the just Judge; he discerns causes, not persons.*

But it might also be objected on the part of servants, What? if we do not obey these earthly masters heartily; can it therefore be thought that God himself will avenge them upon us wretches? It is sufficient that we have experience of miseries in going through life under these hard and imperious masters; we may expect compassion from God rather than punishment. The Apostle cuts off this vain hope also in these persons, and denies that God is any other than just and good, or can favour the poor out of compassion, or withhold from the rich out of envy what is their due. Nay, he hath even removed this *respect of persons* by that broad law in Exod. xxiii. 3, *Thou shalt not countenance a poor man in his cause;* and Levit. xix. 15, *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty.* There is, therefore, *no respect of persons* with God, who, as the poet (Phocylides) rightly said,

*Distributes just rights to every one, and warps not judgment to favour.**

Instructions.

1. Not only those wrongs which are done to kings and the great, but those to subjects and servants, have God alike for their avenger.

2. We must therefore equally avoid both, that we may not sin in either; since both will equally subject us to Divine vengeance.

3. It behoves those who act for God upon the earth, to imitate this Divine justice, and, laying aside all *respect of persons*, render what is due to every one. Well said Archytas, *that the judge amd the altar are the same: for we flee to either as often as wrong is done to us.*† Therefore, that a

* Phocylides, a Greek Poet and Philosopher; a native of Miletus, who flourished about 540 years before the Christian æra. The poem which is extant and goes by his name, is accounted not genuine by some critics.

† Archytas of Tarentum, a soldier, a mathematician, and a celebrated philosopher; eminent alike for his valour and his wisdom. He was repeat-

Judge may be a sanctuary, he ought to protect the poor and men of the lowest estate, as well as the rich and great.

edly chosen general of the Tarentines, and was Plato's instructor, it is said, in geometry. He was one of the first who applied the theory of mathematics to practical purposes, and gave a method of finding two mean proportionals between two given lines, and thence the duplication of the cube, by means of the conic sections. Many marvellous stories are related of his skill in mechanics, such as his constructing a wooden pigeon which could fly, &c. He flourished about 400 years before the birth of Christ, and after acquiring great reputation both in his legislative and military capacity, and being distinguished equally for his modesty and self-command, he was shipwrecked in the Adriatic sea, and his dead body thrown upon the Apulian coast. Horace has finely alluded to this fate of Archytas, in his lib. i. od. 28 :

Te maris et terræ numeroque carentis arenæ
Mensorem cohibent, Archyta,
Pulveris exigui prope littus parva Matinum
Munera ; nec quidquam tibi prodest
Aërias tentâsse domos, animoque rotundum
Percurrisse polum, morituro !

A treatise on the Universe, ascribed to him, and from which probably our Expositor cites the above passage, has been twice printed, at Leipsic, 1564, and at Venice, 1571, both in 4to.

END OF THE THIRD CHAPTER.

CHAP. IV.—Vers. 1.

Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.

This verse, which is placed the first of this fourth Chapter, seems to me to be separated from the foregoing Chapter unadvisedly and without any just grounds. It is referred therefore to the preceding Chapter by Chrysostom, Aquinas, Hugo,* Illyricus,† Musculus,‡ Zanchius, and others: and that it pertains to it, both the matter itself, which is plainly the same with the eight preceding verses, viz. the arrangement, proclaims; as well as the matter of the following verse, which is plainly new, and therefore could more properly be the beginning of a new Chapter. We shall explain this verse, then, as a portion of the for-

* For notices of these three characters, the Reader will consult Vol. i. p. 3 and 111; 33; and 195: or the Index for their respective names.

† Illyricus (Mathias Flacius), a Lutheran Divine, born at Albano, in Istria, in 1520. He studied at Venice, Basil, and Tubingen, and made an open profession of the doctrines of the Reformation. This procured him the friendship of Luther and Melancthon, although he subsequently had a dispute with the latter on the subject of concession to the Romanists, which difference of opinion, as usual, produced considerable enmity. He then removed to Magdeburgh, where he wrote several works, and commenced the collection of an Ecclesiastical History, denominated "The Centuries of Magdeburgh." In 1557 he became professor of Divinity and Hebrew at Jena, but gave up his chair in consequence of a quarrel concerning Original Sin, with Strigelius, another distinguished Divine and Reformer, of Wittemberg. He then removed to Ratisbon, and lastly to Frankfort, where he died in 1575. His principal works are, "Varia Doctorum Piorumque Virorum de Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu," 1557; "Clavis Scripturæ," 2 vols. folio; "Catalogus Testium Veritatis," folio.

‡ Musculus (Wolfgang), a celebrated German Divine and Reformer, was the son of a Cooper, and was born at Dieuze upon Lorraine, in 1497. His parents could give him no education, and he went about begging from door to door by singing, until his talents attracting the notice of a Convent of Benedictines, they offered to receive him into their Order, which he ac-

mer Chapter. Now it consists of two parts: In the former he sets forth to masters their duty; *Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal.* In the latter he adds a stimulus to perform the same; *knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.*

Masters.] Having explained the duty of servants, he would advise masters likewise of their duty: because nothing is more pernicious than a tyrannical master; nothing is more easy than to abuse command. Whence Plato says, it is the best specimen of true justice, *if any one abstain from wounding those whom he may easily injure.* I subjoin his very words, being worthy of observation: Διάδηλος ὁ Φυσει καὶ μη πλαστῶς σέβων την δίκην, μισῶν δὲ ὄντως το ᾽αδικον ἐν τούτοις των ἀνθρωπων εν ὅις ἀυτῶ ῥάδιον ᾽αδικεῖν. De legib. 6. Therefore, lest the Apostle should either seem to have neglected servants, or to have let masters go free of all law,

cordingly entered, and applying himself to study, he both made rapid progress and became a good preacher. About the year 1518, he embraced Lutheranism, which he supported with great zeal: this, as may be supposed, created him a great many enemies. However, nothing dismayed, he made an open profession of his Religion: but he was ere long compelled to flee, and took refuge at Strasburg in 1527. Here he soon afterwards publicly married; but having no provision whatever, he was obliged to send his wife to service in a Clergyman's family, and bind himself apprentice to a weaver, who shortly dismissed him on account of his religious principles. In 1531 he removed to Augsburg, where, on the expulsion of all the priests and monks in 1537, he was made minister of the church consecrated to the Holy Virgin, which he held until 1548, when Charles V. having entered the city, and re-establishing popery, Musculus found it necessary to retire to Switzerland, where, in 1549, he was invited by the Magistrates of Berne, to the Professorship of Divinity. He died at Berne in 1563. Musculus was a man of great learning and application, and considerable master of the Greek and Hebrew languages. He translated the "Comment of St Chrysostom upon St. Paul's Epistles;" the second Volume of the "Works of St. Basil;" the "Scholia of the same Father upon the Psalms;" the "Ecclesiastical Histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Evagrius, and the History of Polybius." He also published "Comments upon some parts of both the Old and New Testaments," and was the author of some original works both in Latin and German, particularly his "Loci Communes," or "Common Places;" which, with other of his Tracts, were published in England during the reign of Elizabeth, in conjunction with the writings of the principal Foreign Reformers.

he bound them also by his precepts. Let us proceed to the precept itself: of which there are two members:

1. *Give unto your servants that which is just.*] τὸ δίκαιον, *that which is just,* in this place includes whatever is due to servants from legal obligation, or according to positive laws; and excludes whatever is contrary to the same. Aristotle, Œcon. i. 5, lays down three things as necessary and due to servants, *their work, their sustenance, their correction.* We shall add also a fourth, viz. *their wages,* which is due to our servants, because they are not slaves, as they were formerly among the antients. It pertains therefore to the justice of masters to render all these things to their servants according to due measure: it is the part of injustice, or at least of folly, if they deal otherwise with them. For instance, in enjoining work upon a servant, he observes justice who neither imposes immoderate labour, nor suffers him to grow stupid in ease and idleness: So in allowing them sustenance, he who neither withholds necessary or convenient food, nor suffers them to indulge gluttony or drunkenness: In applying correction, he who does not inflict punishment upon them with a cruelty exceeding the extent of the fault, nor yet allows them to commit any crime with impunity: In rewarding them, he who is neither so sparing, that they cannot thereby procure for themselves necessaries; nor so lavish, as to yield them matter for dissoluteness. The Greek Scholiast thus expresses the whole point; *It is justice and equality to repay servants for their labour, and to supply them with an abundance of all those things necessary for them.* The other branch of this precept follows:

2. *Give unto your servants that which is equal.*] In the Greek it is την ἰσότητα, *equality* or *equability.* Which word we must not take in that sense, as if it were incumbent upon masters to give to their servants the same honour, the same obedience, which they exact from them. For well spake Plato, τοῖς ἀνίσοις τὰ ἴσα ἄνισα, &c. *To give equal things to unequals is inequality.*

This word ἰσοτης, *equal,* therefore, does not designate the

labours themselves, or the duties of servants and masters, which are different and plainly the reverse: but it refers to the mind and the manner of acting; which in each ought to be equal by a certain proportionate analogy. For instance; Servants are commanded to obey their masters in singleness of heart and the fear of God: now masters give them *that which is equal* when they rule them piously and religiously. Servants are commanded to obey their masters from the heart and with good will: masters repay them for their services, when they rule their servants with mildness and a sort of paternal affection. Therefore, that we may bring the difference of these words *just* and *equal* in this place, under a brief view: That is called *just* which the law requires, or what is due to servants from legal obligation: that is called *equal* which Charity and Christian lenity requires, or what is due to them from moral obligation. Of this *equity* or *equability*, these are the especial duties:

1. To esteem a servant as a partaker of a like nature, and moreover of the same grace; not to look down upon them with a haughty spirit as some are wont to do. For although *master* and *servant* are words expressive of a distinct condition, yet *man* and *man* are names of the same nature. Whence that saying of Philo,* De spec. leg. *For-*

* Philo, surnamed Judæus, in order to distinguish him from several other persons of the same name, was a Jew of Alexandria, descended from a noble and sacerdotal family, and pre-eminent among his contemporaries for his talents, eloquence, and wisdom; and equally as well versed in the doctrines of the Greek Philosophers, as in the peculiar tenets of his own people. The partiality which he felt for the Platonists, seems indeed to have caused much confusion in his mind, through his attempts to amalgamate their philosophy with the Mosaic laws and institutions, and renders it difficult to decide how far his opinions preponderated in favour of either. It has been thought that he embraced Christianity before his death; but the evidence for this assertion does not appear to be sufficient: for though living about our Saviour's time, and probably for some years after his crucifixion, yet there is no reason to believe that he ever visited Judea. Still, as he visited Rome, first in the reign of Caligula, to defend the cause of the Alexandrian Jews, who had been charged with disaffection to the Roman sovereignty—and again in the time of the succeeding emperor, he *might* have learnt something of the important events transacting in that

tune hath distinguished masters from servants; both, however, have one common nature. And to this St. Paul had respect when he directed Philemon to receive back Onesimus, then become a Christian, *Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved.* Philemon, 16.

2. So to act with servants in all things, that that should not be in force,—*Let my will stand for a reason;* but let the master be ready to hearken to them and yield, as often as reason and truth shall require it. Job professes that he had rendered this equity to his servants; and, unless he had done so, would have been obnoxious to the Divine anger: *If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me; What then shall I do when God riseth up; and when he visiteth what shall I answer him?* Job xxxi. 13, 14.

3. To have some regard to human infirmity, and to treat servants debilitated by disease or old age, or any other cause, mildly and compassionately; to cherish and take care of them kindly and affectionately. On this account the Romans seem to me to have termed the master *pater familias,* the *father of the family,* because he ought to embrace all in his family with paternal care and love, as mutually confiding in his fidelity and protection.

4. To give faithful and deserving servants, even beyond the agreement for wages, certain rewards over and above: For when they, by fidelity and love towards their masters,

early period of the Christian epoch; and it is remarkable that his writings contain many sentiments concerning the Logos, or Word, which bear so close a resemblance to those of the Apostle John, and others so allied to the language of St. Paul, as both to exhibit and illustrate the sense of the Hebrew, or at least of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, and lay some ground for the idea of his possessing some insight into Christianity. The late Mr. Bryant has collected the passages of Philo concerning the Logos, in his work entitled, "The Sentiments of Philo Judæus concerning the Λογος, or Word of God; together with large extracts from his writings, compared with the Scriptures on many other particular and essential Doctrines of the Christian Religion." For further information on this interesting subject the Reader is referred to the more enlarged and minute details given in Mr. Horne's "Introduction to the Critical Study," &c. vol. ii. edit. 5, pp. 303, 304. For further particulars of the Life of Philo, let him consult Cave; Du Pin; and Moreri.

shall have shewn themselves more than servants; *equality* requires that their masters by liberality and munificence should shew themselves more than masters. *Let thy soul love a good servant; defraud him not of liberty, neither leave him to want,* Eccles. vii. 21.

Instructions:

From the fact, that even masters are subject to rule.

1. A prudent dispenser of the word ought to instruct, admonish, and reprove, not only servants, or subjects, or men of the lowest rank; but masters, magistrates, and likewise those who have submitted themselves to the yoke of Christ.

2. However it is usual for superiors to complain of the vices of their subjects (and that justly;) yet for the most part they are tainted with no less faults: it is incumbent therefore upon both not so much to exaggerate the faults of another, as each to reform his own.

From that precept of giving servants what is *just:*

1. He is an unjust and wicked master who treats his servants after his own rule, not that of the Divine will: for the will of God is the rule of justice, and always prescribes a golden medium; the human will verges to extremes. Hence said Plato, epist. 9, *A moderate service is what pleases God; an immoderate one what is required by the cupidity of man.**

* Had our Expositor lived in the present day, we should in all probability have had some suitable illustration and admonitions on a point which he has not treated: for what topic of interest and importance connected with the subject in hand, or growing naturally out of his text, has he not discussed? But the condition of slaves was not known in his time, nor, as it has since existed, could have been foreseen. The violation of human liberty in injured Africa, and the horrors of a middle passage had not been discovered. The system which he has but touched had not been fully developed: the sound of the slave-whip—the details of shooting excursions—the moanings of separated parents and children, husbands and wives—and the shrieks and groans of mutilated innocence and female torture, had not been heard on this side of the Atlantic. The exclusion of Missionary efforts and Religion from those dragged from their homes, and with nought besides to comfort them, had not been reported in England; and a thousand other abominations contrary to Christian piety, practised upon the unoffending

2. But those are here to be blamed who offend on either side against that rule of justice which we have described from the beginning. Many think that they are provident and frugal, whilst they tame their servants with labours and stripes, and wear them out with hunger and fastings: Some, on the other hand, boast of their kindness for their servants, because they permit them to run abroad in idleness, and to waste their days in drunken banquetings. But neither practise *that which is just.*

From the precept of giving that which is *equal,*

1. A Christian master ought not only to consider what is the law or custom of humanity, but above all, what charity and Christian usage enjoin him to give his servants. If he shall not have performed the former, he acts unjustly even according to the judgment of men; if he has not discharged the latter, he acts wickedly and cruelly in the sight of God.

2. The law of analogy, or *equity,* ought to prevail among all orders of men: and whatever superiors require from their dependants, they ought, equally, if not in kind, yet in analogy, to compensate the same. Thus much as to the precept.

Knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.] Here he adds the inducement to the observance of the precept. And this is twofold: One consists in this, that they should know that they also have a Master; *knowing that ye also have a Master.* The other, that they should know what manner of Master they have—*in heaven.*

Knowing that ye also have a Master] i. e. *Holding, believing, considering* that ye likewise and your servants are subject to a Master. This consideration is a sharp stimulus to render justice and equity to servants, because it strikes at injustice and iniquity. For on this account it is masters think to do what they please with servants, because

Negro, had not been brought to light. In a word, the subject of West Indian Slavery had not been investigated; the wrongs of an injured mass of human beings, as existing in the British Colonies, and the claims of *justice* and *equity* on their behalf, had not come under consideration, nor been echoed through a land of professing Christians.

they imagine that they alone are servants only, that themselves are absolute masters, and nothing else but masters. They are commanded, therefore, to know and remember, that they also are servants of the same supreme Master, and on that account fellow-servants with their servants: Now it is far from reason, that a servant, although a little more honourable, should act unjustly and tyrannically with his fellow servants; because he would not like that God himself should act in the same manner towards him.

Ye have a Master in heaven.] By this expression he would indicate what sort of a Master masters themselves also have; viz. *an heavenly* one, i. e. just, almighty, omniscient, in one word, GOD. This consideration also very much conduces to repress the injustice of masters. For they behave themselves haughtily towards their servants, because for the most part they have not the power of resisting them, and because they appear to have no judge or defender, who might avenge the wrongs offered to them. The Apostle, therefore, bids masters themselves to bear in mind that they have a Master, and that not a mortal, but an heavenly one, who will not suffer them to abuse with impunity the authority delegated to them over their servants. The subjects then to such a Master, ought religiously to obey him in all things, and to observe justice and equity.

First, because this heavenly Master is omniscient, so that nothing can be concealed from him which is done rashly and unjustly. Now it is the extreme of audacity, whilst the heavenly Master is looking on, to treat fellow-servants inconsiderately and cruelly. For that wicked servant mentioned in the Gospel dared not to afflict his fellow-servants until he saw his master was gone into a far country. Since, however, this heavenly Master is never absent from us, it is never safe to act frowardly.

Secondly, because this heavenly Master is holy and just, and hates all injustice. Earthly masters, indeed, sometimes either countenance the wickedness of servants, or at least wink at it; because they themselves are equally wicked: but there is no hope that he can please the heavenly

Master who dares to violate justice and equity. *The wicked and his ungodliness are both alike hateful unto God,* Wisd. xiv. 9.

Thirdly, because this Master in heaven, is Almighty: he therefore can punish that which he hates; nor can any one pluck himself out of his hands. He is the Ruler over all, neither stands in awe of any man's greatness: and *a stronger than the strongest shall bring a sore trial upon the mighty,* Wisd. vi. 7, 8. Let masters, then, think of these things: that they have a Master; that they have a Master in heaven, i. e. all-seeing, a hater of all injustice, and almighty: and this shall constrain them to render justice and equity to their servants.

Hence learn,

1. That the faithful and godly should so carry themselves towards their inferiors, as always to remember that they have a higher Master.

2. That it is too much the custom among men of power and appointed to high station, to forget this supreme and common Master.

3. This forgetfulness is the origin of all injustice and iniquity: as is evident in Pharaoh, Exod. v. 2, *I know not the Lord; I will not let Israel go.*

4. We therefore should perpetually think what a Master we have in heaven, that this very thought may be a stimulus to excite us to equity, and a restraint to keep us from injustice and tyranny.

5. It behoves us to treat our servants with that clemency which we desire that our heavenly Master may use towards us.

And thus ye have an explication of this economical exhortation, as it were, of the Apostle; which we have referred to the third Chapter. Now let us proceed to the exposition of the last Chapter.

EXPOSITION

OF

THE FOURTH CHAPTER.

I PREMISE a few things concerning the argument of this Chapter; afterwards I shall proceed direct to the explication of the context. Therefore, after having delivered the domestic precepts, which are accommodated to individuals according to the varied condition of the persons, the Apostle reverts to certain general exhortations, which he propounds to all in common. To these he immediately subjoins an honourable mention of Tychicus and Onesimus, by whom this Epistle was sent to the Colossians. At length he salutes by name those of the many pious persons who then dwelt at Rome, and commands this Epistle to be publicly read in the Church, and so concludes it.

The principal divisions of this Chapter are three:

Exhortations,
Commendations,
Salutations.

He exhorts to three things:

Perseverance in prayer; in verses 2, 3, 4.
Wisdom in conversation; vers. 5.
Discretion in speech; vers. 6.

He commends to them two eminent men,

Tychicus, vers. 7, 8: Onesimus; vers. 9.

As to the rest of this Epistle, almost the whole is taken up with salutations, and a few occasional additions.

Let us come to the context.

Vers. 2, &c.

Continue in prayer (or, *apply with all earnestness*) *and watch in the same with thanksgiving*, &c.

In this verse and the two following, he stirs up the Colossians to that most divine and useful work of *prayer*. In treating which, it is not my intention to explain this trite subject of prayer; but only to expound those things which are expressly touched by the Apostle in the context itself. Now these in general are two: 1. Certain conditions requisite in the persons themselves who pray, in this second verse. 2. Certain and very necessary materials of special prayer, or causes of praying, vers. 3, 4.

Three conditions are enumerated in this place:

Earnest perseverance,
Cautious watchfulness,
Pious gratitude:

Of each in their order.

Continue in prayer, Τῇ προσευχῃ προσκαρτερεῖτε.] This Greek word is derived from κάρτος, which with one letter transposed is the same as κράτος, that is, *strength, earnestness, victory*. Hence καρτερειν, *to endure with fortitude*, or *strenuously to persevere*, and προσκαρτερειν, to apply with ardour and assiduity to any difficult and laborious thing, until you shall have brought it to the wished-for end, and shall have obtained the victory, as it were. Προσκαρτερησις, therefore, involves these two things: a certain earnest intention of mind, and as it were struggle, whilst occupied in prayer; and an assiduous frequency in prayer: *with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit*, Ephes. vi. 18.

As to this earnestness, or intention of mind; it is indeed very necessary on many accounts:

1. Because the occasions for prayer of this kind are such as ought greatly to excite the human mind to perform

this work seriously and with the whole strength. For the magnitude of our intention is always wont to correspond, at least, it ought to correspond, to the magnitude of the business which is undertaken: But now, as says Parisiensis, De Rhet. divin. cap. 38, *there is no business that can be compared with that of obtaining pardon, grace, and glory: but these are things which in an especial manner are sought by prayer.* Therefore, to seek such great and good things frigidly, perfunctorily,—in a way of duty merely,—what else is it but to mock God?

2. Because those dead and sleepy prayers, which are uttered with a mind either wandering or benumbed, neither reach heaven, nor can move God to hear. For our prayer stands instead of a messenger between us and God; but if a messenger shall either loiter, or sleep by the way, he will neither reach the end of his journey, nor effect the business entrusted to him. Hence says Cyprian, De orat. Dom. *With what effrontery dost thou require to be heard of God, when thou dost not thyself hear the sounds of thy own voice?*

3. This intention of mind and fervour of spirit in prayer is required, because the heart, inflamed with this spiritual heat, immediately grows soft and is dilated, and becomes more apt and capable for receiving the Divine gifts. And I think this was the cause that the Egyptian Brethren should have wished to use *the most brief and rapid ejaculations in prayer;* namely, *that their intention should not vanish and be blunted through delays,* as says Augustine, De orando Deo, ad Probam. Epist. 121. cap. 10.

4. This intention and ardor of mind is most especially desirable even on the account, that it is a most sure sign of a pious and devoted mind; as, on the other hand, a cold and sleepy prayer is a mark of a carnal mind, and one rivetted to earthly things. Thus says Chrysostom, lib. 1, De orando Deo, *When I see any one not diligent in prayer, it is forthwith clear to me, that he can possess nothing exalted in his mind: again, where I behold any one earnest and very persevering in prayer, I conclude that he is endowed with all virtue and piety.*

5. Because this ardent desire, upon the testimony of Scripture, breaks forth in the prayers of all the saints. Jacob by this effort of fervid prayer, when he wrestled with God himself, came off conqueror, Gen. xxxii. 28. Moses by this same tied up as it were the hand of God, nor suffered him to destroy the rebellious Israelites. On account of this earnestness, David every where calls prayer his *cry*. In a word; This intention and fervour has ever greatly availed to the effectual obtaining of the object prayed for, as the Apostle James testifies, v. 1, *the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.* What is that fervent prayer, ενεργουμενη δεησις, but prayer excited, actuated, and as it were quickened, by some influence of the Spirit?

And thus much of the earnestness, or intention of mind, which is required in the act itself of prayer, and intimated by this word προσκαρτερείτε, *continue* or *apply with all earnestness, in prayer.*

But it is said, by this word προσκαρτερειτε is further intimated the assiduity or frequency of this exercise; which ought to be such and so continual, that in that respect we are commanded in the holy Scriptures *to pray always.* Christ himself teaches his disciples by a parable, *that we ought always to pray, and not to faint,* Luke xviii. 1. *Pray without ceasing,* says the Apostle, 1 Thess. v. 17. Which places are not to be taken in that sense, as though, leaving and renouncing all other concerns, we should only be occupied in and cleave to prayer: but as Augustine has rightly observed, that charge, PRAY WITHOUT CEASING, *is to be received thus soberly, that certain seasons of prayer should not be omitted in any day.* De hæres. ad Quodvultdeum, hær. 57. Psallianorum seu Euchitarum. For he is deemed never to cease from his work, who works when he can and ought. This perseverance of prayer then, does not require an uninterrupted, but a frequently repeated act of prayer: that is to say, we should not lay aside the desire of prayer, either by the weariness of expectation, or the despair of obtaining, or for any other cause whatever; but we should invoke God frequently, and frequently plead with him, even when he seems to have shut his ears to our prayers. And this is the meaning of the Greek phrase.

It is not my intention here to shew how often every day, or at what hours we should pray: but we must shew that we ought to be occupied very often, yea, very frequently, in this exercise. As to the point of time, it is fit that we consult the Spirit and the occasion.

Inducements for the frequency of the exercise of prayer.

1. Our prayer ought to be constant; 1. Because we have constant and infinite causes for prayer. For whatever good we have, or desire to have; whatever evil we either suffer, or deserve to suffer, or fear; all these things supply matter for prayer. The blessings which we have excite to prayer; because in this manner God is to be honoured on account of the benefits received: the blessings which we want stir up to prayer; because they are to be looked for from God alone. The evils which we suffer call to prayer; because they can be removed by God alone: the evils which we fear; because by Him alone can they be banished. Hence the holy Fathers named prayer, *the sacrifice of the Christian, the key of heaven, the supply of want, the scourge of the devil,* &c. We have an example of the constancy of prayer in Eusebius, lib. 2. cap. 23.

2. Because constancy and importunity is the most efficacious means of obtaining what we seek; as Christ has taught us in that parable, Luke xviii.; and has also shewn in his own dealing towards the Canaanitish woman importunately beseeching him, and urging her prayers again and again, Matt. xv. Hence Gregory, in Psal. vi. Pœnitent. says, *God would be asked, would be compelled, would be conquered as it were by importunity: this violence is good, wherewith God is not offended, but placated.*

3. Because this perseverance in prayer greatly contributes to the declaring, increasing, and strengthening our faith. For it is the property of a proud and disdainful petitioner, to suffer no delays, and immediately to draw back from prayer on account of any adjournment. Hence that speech, 2 Kings vi. 33, *What should I wait for the Lord any longer?* But on the other hand, David, in Psal. v. 3, says, *In the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee and will look up.*

Faith then will not immediately draw back, but abide as it were in hope, and wait until it shall seem good to God to grant its request.

Instructions regarding the intention arising from these considerations.

1. Whereas we are excited by the Apostle to intensity and fervour of mind in prayer, we must conclude, that we are by nature frigid and torpid in this exercise, so that we can scarcely abstain from sleep unless we have a monitor and one to arouse us. The drowsiness of Apostles themselves testifies this, Matt. xxvi. 40.

2. We must therefore beseech God to impart to us the Spirit of prayer: for flesh and blood neither knows nor can understand the true and just ground of prayer without the teaching and inspiration of the Spirit. Hence that declaration in Rom. viii. 2, *We know not what to pray for as we ought*, &c.

3. Hence we clearly deduce, that the prayers of those persons are of none, or of little moment, who by no sense, no understanding of those things which are uttered, mutter forth their daily prayers, that they may be only said thereby to have prayed. But they might have learnt even from this place, that prayer is not a mere matter of duty, but a serious and laborious concern, in which it behoves us to be instant, not to sleep.

The Papists, therefore, deserve every odium, who would have a Christian people to hear public prayers in an unknown tongue, and also to babble their private prayers in an unknown tongue; as though they only desired to render a most divine and useful thing ridiculous, unfruitful, and becoming parrots more than men. We shall briefly glance at this error.

It is clear, that there is required in serious prayer both a consideration of those things which we ask of God, and an ardent desire of the same. Cyprian, De orat. Domin. thus writes concerning consideration, *Let every carnal thought be banished; neither let the mind think (in prayer) of any thing else than that alone for which it is praying.* Concerning the desire, Parisiensis, De Rhetor. Div. cap. 28,

thus expresses himself, *The desire of obtaining what is sought is the voice of prayer; without this, prayer is dumb.* But now neither the thought, nor the desire of those things which are asked, is found in those who do not understand what they ask from God.

Paul condemns those prayers which are not understood; who concludes that we cannot say *Amen* to the prayers which are not understood, 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Augustine hath condemned it; who, in his book De magistro, cap. i. thus writes, *The people ought to understand the prayers of their priests, that they may have their attention fixed upon God by a common feeling.* Even the very Papists themselves among whom there was any thing of mind or firmness, have censured this error of the Romanists. Parisiensis, De Rhetor. Divin. c. 38, where he compares prayer to a messenger, says, *It is reckoned among the follies of that messenger, that he neither cares nor thinks of those concerns except this alone, that he offers a petition to God, and is altogether ignorant what it contains, and what is sought by it. And these things are manifest in all those praying persons, who mutter with their lips alone, understanding nothing whatever of those things which the words of their prayers signify.* And in Cap. 40, where he calls prayer *the calf of the lips,* he thus writes, *The flesh of that calf is the perceptions and consideration of those things which are signified by the words of prayer; the marrow is the pious intention of the person praying; the hairs of that calf are the external vocal sounds. They slay the sacrifice therefore, and defraud God of the better part of the calf, who either understand not, or care not about the signification of the words.* Thus far Parisiensis. John Gerson, although involved in the error of the Roman church, denies this to be necessarily the case as far as regards the illiterate; yet he voluntarily confesses that the conversion of the heart to God at the time of prayer, all things considered, is more laudable if it be done according to the words and the meaning of the prayer. Lastly, Cajetan is convicted of error by the theologians of Paris, in having written that it is better that prayers should be said in the vulgar and known tongue, than in the Latin which is not

understood. But how does he defend himself? *I have not written,* says he, *that it is better, but that it is* BETTER FOR THE EDIFICATION OF THE CHURCH; *neither have I written* PRAYERS, *but* PUBLIC PRAYERS, WHICH ARE SAID IN THE HEARING OF THE PEOPLE; *and this I have founded upon the doctrine of St. Paul,* 1 Cor. xiv. These things are from Cajetan in answer to certain articles put forth in the name of the Paris divines; which work is found after the third part of Aquinas. I will not dwell any longer on the refutation of this most absurd error, which does away as it were the very soul of prayer: for rightly said Athanasius, in orat. 16, against Maximus the philosopher,* *to dispute about things more clear and more manifest than the sun, is nothing else than to suggest evil things to men defending the cause of dishonesty and impudence.* Thus much concerning the intention or fervour of persons praying.

Instructions referring to constancy or perseverance.

1. This exhortation itself to perseverance in prayer discloses the depravity of our nature, which causes us to cleave too much to carnal things and pleasures; but, on the contrary, on that account to be sluggish and grow weary in spiritual things. For nothing is more pleasant to a healthy soul than to pour forth its desires into the bosom of its heavenly Father; which, nevertheless, we are not able to do without weariness.

2. We must above all things take care not to be drawn away at any time from this so necessary exercise of prayer by our pleasures, our business, or any other hindrances. For like as if you should cut the nerves, you would leave the whole body without motion and strength as a huge trunk; so if you set aside prayer (which Chrysostom calls *the nerve of the soul)* you render the man altogether maimed and feeble, and without any spiritual motion. And here the eminent example of Daniel is set before us, who could not be restrained from prayer even for one day,

* MAXIMUS TYRIUS, a celebrated philosopher of the second century, a native of Tyre, in Phœnicia, whence he took his name, and who appears to have adopted the principles of the Platonic school, with an inclination to scepticism.

either by the royal edict, or the risk of death; as may be seen, Dan. vi. 11.

3. Hence we may infer the misery of the ungodly and unbelievers: who, as they are void of faith and the love of God, cannot indeed pray, except for form's sake, much less can they *continue in prayer*. But what is more miserable than he who cannot hold any commerce with the very fountain of blessedness?

4. Hence appears the happiness of the godly and faithful: who as they enjoy fervent and persevering prayer as an inexhaustible treasure, can never want any thing which is necessary and beneficial for them. For *if ye being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?* And thus much of fervor and perseverance.

2. *Watch in the same.*] Here we have another attendant of just and legitimate prayer, namely, watchfulness. And we may refer this watchfulness either to what are properly called vigils, that is, to the stated and customary watches of the night; or to the vigils called so metaphorically, that is, the constant watchings of a Christian mind: yea, it may be allowed us to join both advantageously.

As to those nightly vigils; it is clear, that the Christians of the Apostle's times, on account of the cruelty of the pagans, were often compelled by a kind of necessity to nocturnal assemblies, when they would either preach the gospel, or offer public prayers to God; as is manifest from Acts xii. 12, and xx. 7, and in other places. Moreover, for the sake of exciting solemnity and devotion, when the Emperors were converted to the Christian religion, and their affairs were settled and flourishing, they retained the custom of the vigils, and most especially celebrated them when the anniversary of the festivals approached. Hence the sermons of the Fathers upon the vigils of the Nativity, the vigils of Easter: we also read even now of the custom upon the vigils of the martyrs. Now they spent these vigils in the word and prayers, and prepared themselves beforehand in this manner for the

more holy observation of the feast, and the participation of the Lord's supper. We shall bring some testimonies of the Fathers. Tertullian, in 2 lib. ad uxorem, shews that Christian women ought not to marry heathen husbands, by the argument derived from these vigils: *What heathen,* says he, *would willingly bear that his wife should go from his side to these nocturnal convocations? Who will carelessly allow her to pass her night in the Pascal solemnities?* Before they assembled at the vigils that they were accustomed to sit up in the night, Athanasius also proves, Apol. ad Constadt. where he complains that they were oppressed by the Syrian president, for whilst they were intent upon prayer, he sent his soldiers among them. Nazianzen mentions these vigils, in Orat. 27, and Orat. 2. in Julian: and Bernard, on the vigil of St. Andrew, says, *He is an unworthy man who does not observe the appointed abstinence of the vigil with solemn joy.*

Now, besides these public vigils assigned to the public assemblies of Christians, we may also observe that pious and holy men sometimes spent sleepless nights in private devotion, or applied most earnestly to prayer. Thus David frequently affirms, that he even ceased not in the night from prayer, Ps. xxii. 2, and lxxvii. 6. So Paul and Silas shut up in prison, called upon God in the middle of the night, Acts xvi. 25.

Concerning those public vigils which necessity brought upon the Church, we mention that one; the reason thereof ceasing, they are now not improperly done away by our Church: for that they would be liable to many disadvantages and dangers, no wise man will deny, who has surveyed the manners of this age. Moreover it is gathered from Canon 35 of the Council of Eliberis,* that many in-

* This was the third Council of the Church in the fourth Century (for the Council of Sinuessa, said to have been assembled on the alleged apostasy of Marcellinus, ought not to be admitted in the number of Councils) said to have been held at Eliberis or Elvira, now Granada, in Spain, about the year 305. It passed 81 Canons touching such a variety of matters that it is supposed to have adopted several antient codes, or to have drawn into one collection the Canons of the preceding Councils of Spain. The Canon

conveniences arose from thence in the antient church; where the women were debarred from these vigils, because that under the cloak of prayer, they committed secret wickedness. And the abuses at the vigils of the martyrs which had almost been the usage and the law, are censured in Augustine. See De morib. eccles. cathol. cap. 34. epist. 64, and in many places in his Sermons.

Now as to the devotion of private persons, who, not being content with daily prayer, even watch in the night; it is indeed truly laudable, if it be destitute of superstition, and arises out of zeal for the Divine name, and finally be employed when there seems great and just cause to exact this vigilance. David, yea Christ himself, furnishes us with an example for this watchfulness, Matt. xxvi. 38, 39. Paul also imitates his Master in this matter, 2 Cor. vi. 5. Nor are these vigils only laudable, but they are also delightful to the pious; as Augustine truly says, De bono viduit. cap. 21, *Vigils in as far as they do not injure the health, if spent in praying, singing, or reading, are converted into spiritual pleasures.*

Hitherto we have spoken concerning vigils properly so called. It remains that we treat those so termed metaphorically and figuratively, that is, the vigils of the mind; which are plainly necessary, not only in our prayers, but in our whole life, and therefore ought to be perpetual. Now I say that the mind is vigilant or watchful, when no ways asleep in sin and worldly things; but always lively expects the day of death and the coming of Christ, and tastes beforehand, as it were, future glory in hope and a sure faith. He who keeps his mind prepared in this man-

referred to by our Expositor is given in these words:—"We have thought fit to hinder women from spending the night in the Cemeteries, because oftentimes under pretence of praying they commit in secret great crimes." This Council has been mostly celebrated for condemning all use whatever of pictures in Churches; a decisive proof in itself, if proof were wanting, that the use of images was then unknown in the Christian Church. "We would not," says the 36th Canon, "have pictures placed in Churches, that the object of our worship and adoration should not be painted on the walls." The 34th Canon prohibited also the use of lighted candles in the Cemeteries of the dead, that the spirits of the saints might not be disturbed.

ner, he lives in perpetual watchfulness; he who neglects this vigilance of mind, he, although he may pass days and nights in prayer, is, notwithstanding, judged to sleep. To this vigilance of mind Christ calls us in

Mark xiii. 35, 36, *Watch, for ye know not when,* &c.

Rev. iii. 2, *Be watchful,* &c.

Rev. xvi. 15, *Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth,* &c.

Paul,

1 Cor. xvi. 13, *Watch ye; stand fast in the faith,* &c.

1 Thess. v. 6, *Let us not sleep, but let us watch,* &c.

Peter,

1 Epis. v. 8, *Watch, because your adversary,* &c.

It therefore behoves us to observe these vigils, if we wish either ourselves or our prayers to be acceptable to God. Hence Augustine, Serm. 23, in Evang. Matt. *Watch in heart, watch in faith, watch in charity, watch in good works.* And Bernard, in vigil. Petri et Pauli; *Vigils are proposed for this end, that we may awake, if we shall have slept in any sin.* Yea, as Cyprian speaks, De orat. Domin. *All godly men ought, even when they sleep with their eyes, to watch with their heart.* As it is written of the person of the Church, *I sleep, but my heart waketh,* Cant. v. 2.

Instructions.

1. Hence is inferred the sottishness of our age: For we, as often as we assemble for public prayers or the preaching of the word, thereupon sleep in open day; whereas our forefathers in the primitive church, passed even whole nights without sleep with alacrity, that they might enjoy these spiritual exercises

2. Our impiety and vanity is also inferred: For vigils among us are scarcely destined to any thing but wickedness or foolishness.

3. We may also conclude: That he raises his voice in vain to God in prayer, who sleeps in the conversation of his life: For God requires no less, nay, much more watchful minds than eyes, from those invoking his name.

4. The prayers of the ungodly and impenitent are accounted dreams rather than desires; because they are recited whilst the heart sleeps in sin. Thus far of watchfulness.

With thanksgiving] We come to the last condition which is required in persons praying, and in prayer itself, namely, gratitude, and thanksgiving flowing from thence. And rightly indeed is thanksgiving coupled with prayer: For in praying, whether we have respect to benefits already received, or look forward to those to be received, whether we consider those deferred, or altogether denied; on all these accounts we are bound to give thanks.

1. It is just that those seeking and expecting new benefits should shew themselves grateful on account of those before received: because, as even Aristotle rightly and wisely observed, Ethic. 9, *A return is required to preserve friendship:* but to God we have nothing that we can return except gratitude, Ps. cxvi. 12, *What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits towards me? I will take the cup of salvation,* &c.

2. We ought to shew ourselves grateful for benefits received; because in vain does he ask new benefits who shews himself unmindful of those supplied; *The hope of the unthankful shall melt away as the winter's hoar frost,* Wisd. xvi. 29.

3. Thanks are even to be given for those deferred, yea, for those denied. For when those things which we seek are deferred, it is done that they may be conferred at the most advantageous time for us; that we may esteem them more when bestowed: when they are altogether denied, it so happens, because God knew that those things would be hurtful to us which we judged for our advantage; on the contrary, that those would be as useful, which seemed to us to be bitter and unpleasant. This is what Chrysostom intimates, when he says, that *we must thank God, not only for manifest benefits, but for more hidden ones, which are afforded us unsolicited and in opposition to our desires.* Of this kind are sickness, poverty, persecution, and almost all those things which are commonly thought hard to be endured. And among these and the like, the opinion of Augustine, in Epist. Joan. tract. 6, is to be received, who asserts, that the pious and faithful, when they are not heard according *to their will,* yet are heard *to their safety.*

On these grounds, therefore, it is manifest, that thanksgiving, inasmuch as it is a tribute due to God on many accounts, is never to be intermitted.

Hence we are taught,

1. That almost all men are more prone to ask and to complain, than to be thankful.

2. That those ungrateful men are wholly unfit to offer unto God the sacrifice of prayer.

3. That good and evil are not to be measured by our sense, but must be left to the judgment of God our Father: for here is the fountain of ingratitude, that we do not believe those things to be best for us which are sent by God. The old poet was not undeservedly praised by Plato, in Alcibiades, lib. 2, because he had prescribed to his friends this form of prayer,

> *O Jupiter, grant to us thy blessings whether we pray for them or withhold our prayers,*
> *And repel from us all evils even though we pray for them.*

4. That we must not be rash or angry, if those things should be denied us which we desire; but rather give thanks to God the Father, who lovingly and prudently denies us hurtful things, even when they are foolishly and inconsiderately sought by us.

5. That nothing can happen to the pious and faithful, for which they may not and ought not to give the most deserved thanks; according to that injunction of the Apostle, 1 Thess. v. 18, *In all things give thanks.* Thus much for the condition of legitimate prayer.

Vers. 3, 4.

Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds:

That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.

Many things are to be prayed for from Almighty God, both on our own account and that of others: but the Apostle, passing by other things, excites the Colossians to seek one great and necessary thing, namely, the propagation and increase of the Gospel. And that very justly too: for when this celestial light has diffused itself, and penetrates the hearts of men, all other blessings of God are added to them without asking. Matt. vi. 33.

In these two verses two things are to be observed generally: For whom we must most especially pray; What on their account is to be earnestly sought from God.

For whom? *For us*] That is, For me and the other faithful ministers of the Gospel.

What is to be sought?
- The faculty, liberty, efficacy of preaching; *A door of utterance.*
- The use or exercise of this faculty; *To speak the mystery of Christ*, &c.
- The proper manner of exercising the same; *as I ought to speak.*

Withal praying also for us.] In the preceding verse (as you have heard) he excited the Colossians to constant prayer: Now he teaches that it behoved them to remember, not only themselves, but also their brethren, and especially ministers. Thus in 2 Cor. i. 11, the Apostle says, that he trusted for Divine assistance, the Corinthians

helping together with him to propitiate God by prayer. Nor is it without cause they who desire the increase of the Gospel from the heart, are excited to pray for the Apostles and other ministers; because a good and faithful minister is the public treasure of the Church, and therefore to be loved and cared for by all who love or care for the edification of the Church.

Hence let us observe,

1. That it is the duty of all the pious, assiduously and earnestly to pray to God for pastors and ministers of the Gospel.

2. That they who do not love them even for their vocation alone, although they have nothing else worthy of their love, have little of the Christian mind; they who vex and harass them, are plainly of a diabolical spirit. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.

3. They who are in a low station, and of less sanctity, nevertheless may and ought to pray for them who are in a more eminent station, and endowed with greater sanctity: For the Apostle himself not only did not despise the prayers of the people of Colosse, but importuned them to a still greater degree. Hence says Augustine, in Psal. xxxviii. *The Apostle prays for the people; the people pray for the Apostle: all the members pray for themselves; The Head intercedes for all.*

4. To pray God for others we have no need of the mediatorial intercession of any one, but of mutual charity and necessity. Augustine speaks admirably on this head, cont. epist. Parmen. lib. 2. cap. 8, where he reprehends Parmenianus,* because he had said that a bishop is a mediator between the people and God: and he forthwith adds, *All Christians commend themselves to one another's prayers. But he for whom no one mediates, but he himself for all, he is the only and true Mediator.* See more in the same, tom. 7.

5. That the Papists vainly and foolishly, in those dumb prayers of the living, endeavour to ground that mediato-

* This was a schismatical African bishop, elected by the Donatists, after Donatus, their chief, in 350; he wrote several things in defence of his heresy, which were refuted by Optatus and Augustine.

rial and meritorious intercession of dead saints for the church militant. For the living do not offer meritorious prayers to God for the living, but only suppliantly unite their prayers with those of their brethren. But whoever does this on another's account, does not set himself up as an intercessor properly so called, or as the advocate of another; but only joins suppliantly in the same petitions. Therefore, whatever may be determined about the universal prayers of the church triumphant for the safety of the church militant, it should ever be remembered, that Christ is the only Mediator both of redemption and of meritorious intercession with God the Father. Thus much of the persons.

That God would open unto us a door of utterance.] Here he proceeds to shew what he most especially wished that they should ask from God on his account and that of other ministers, namely, that he would open a door of utterance to them. Christ, in Luke xxi. 15, calls this faculty, *a mouth and wisdom; I will give you a mouth, and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.* And wisely indeed does the Apostle require this door of his soul to be opened by God; because he alone illuminates the minds of men in this knowledge of Divine things, he alone furnishes the gifts requisite for the discharge of such an office. He opened a door of utterance to Moses, who was by nature *slow of speech, and of a slow tongue,* Exod. iv. 10. And in the same place he manifestly claims this prerogative to himself, vers. 11, 12: *Who hath made man's mouth? Have not I the Lord? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say.* So also Paul refers his faculty to the gratuitous gift of God, 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6, *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God: who hath made us able ministers,* &c. Hence Clemens, Strom. I, says, *There is one teacher both of the preacher and of the hearer; he who supplies the fountain even of the sense and of the word:* Εἷς ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ τοῦ λέγοντος καὶ τοῦ ακροωμένου, ὁ επιπηγάξων καὶ τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὸν λόγον.

Instructions.

1. Nothing more salutary can be sought from God on

behalf of others, than that they may be qualified for the duties of their calling by the Divine bounty.

2. This is one cause why so many unlearned persons invade the ecclesiastical office, that the people do not with their whole heart seek from God able ministers: for he it is who gives to the Church apostles, teachers, evangelists, fitted for the work of the ministry. See Ephes. iv.

3. No one relying upon the strength of his natural abilities, or his erudition, ought to undertake this office of an evangelist, but to depend upon Divine grace and the Divine benediction.

4. Even they who are furnished with the greatest gifts, should notwithstanding daily seek from God, that the same gifts may be given, preserved, increased to them. Thus the Apostle, to whom was given an extraordinary knowledge of the gospel by special revelation, yet requests that prayer should be offered even for himself, that a door of utterance may be opened unto him more and more.

2. Since God is intreated to open a door of utterance to ministers, we may understand, that he gives them the liberty of preaching the Gospel, and opens as it were the way, when all obstacles are removed which the world and the devil are wont to oppose to the preaching of the Gospel. For it is the custom of Satan and his minions to gnash at the manifestation of the Gospel, and to employ all their arts to shut out this saving light; but God on the other hand interposes his authority, restrains the wicked and their leader, the devil, and against their will and resistance, opens the door to the preachers of his Gospel.

In the first publication of the Gospel this was most manifest, when almost the whole world conspired to close the door of gospel utterance; but God, notwithstanding, opened so wide a door for it, that by means of a few fishermen it was diffused through the whole earth like lightning;* as the Apostle testifies Col. i. 23. This the Fathers were always accustomed to allege against the heathen, and by this wonderful spread of the Gospel, to prove that its

* Matt. xxiv. 14.

truth flowed from God. Thus Clemens, Strom. 7, near the end, says; *The Grecian philosophy, if any magistrate prohibited it, immediately died away; but our doctrine, even from the first preaching of it, kings, generals, and magistrates, with all their satellites, forbad; nevertheless it does not droop like human doctrine, but flourishes the more.* How was this, unless because, by the faithful earnestly praying for it, God opened to it a door that it might go forth even in spite of its enemies? Moreover, God, upon the pious constantly intreating for it, sometimes inclined the hearts of princes, not only not to oppose the Gospel, but to succour the ministers, and promote the progress of the Gospel. Thus he influenced Constantine, and after him Theodosius, and many other emperors, so that, renouncing paganism, they embraced the Christian religion. So in our age, and that of our ancestors, he influenced many princes, so that rejecting and extirpating Papistical superstitions, they opened a door for the Gospel by their own authority. On these accounts Paul rightly advises the Colossians, to pray that God would open a door of utterance to himself and the rest of the ministers of the Gospel: for this regards the power of God.

Instructions.

1. Ministers endeavour in vain to spread the Gospel, if God open not to them a door of utterance, and remove external obstacles out of the way.

2. It is the duty of every godly man, not only to ask of God, that he would extend the free course of the Gospel; but also to exert all his own energies to do so himself.

3, They are therefore to be detested who cast any hindrance in the way of the word and its ministers, and, as much as in them lies, shut and bar this door. In this class are to be placed tyrants, who persecute the ministers of the Gospel; heretics, who attack the doctrine of the Gospel; and false and mistaken politicians, who lay it down as a principle, that it is of no consequence whether a door be opened for true Religion or papistical superstí-

tion, only that they may enjoy external advantages;* and, lastly, Simoniacal patrons, who cheat the ministers of the Gospel of their due stipend, and seize upon what they ought to receive.

3. When God is invoked to open a door of utterance to his ministers, we also pray that he would give the efficacy to the word of the Gospel of penetrating the minds of men, and would open the doors of the hearts in the hearers of it. So Gregory understood this passage, writing on Job xxxviii.; where these words are used, *Paul prayed for a door to be opened by the Lord in the heart of his hearers to the mysteries of the Gospel. For he had the thunder of the word, but he prayed for a way to be opened to it; for he knew that it was not in his own power to give the way to it.* Therefore the Apostle advises wisely, that God should be invoked to open the door of the hearts of men; because the utterance of preachers obtains this grace from the Spirit, the enlightening the understanding of the hearer, the influencing his affections, and, finally, the entering into and healing the will: Thus truly said Aquinas, Q. 2. qu. 177, art. 1, where he disputes about the grace of utterance. And this the Scriptures often teach: for instance, in Acts xvi. 14, where God is said whilst Paul was preaching, *to have opened the heart of Lydia, that she might attend to the things which were spoken;* and Ephes. i. 17, 18, where Paul prays God that *he would give* the Ephesians *the Spirit of wisdom and revelation, that the eyes of their understanding, oculos cordium illorum, might be enlightened,* &c. and in all the passages where faith is declared to be *the gift of God:* For by faith the door of the heart is opened for the admission of the Gospel: therefore, he who gives faith opens the door of the heart to the Gospel. And hence it is that Augustine, De prædest. sanct. cap. 20, asserts, that this prayer to which the Apostle excites the Colossians for

* While Christians in the present day have had to deplore the inapplicability of a remark in the last explanatory section, they have lived to hear the truth and witness the mischief of this latter one with a vengeance.

opening a door of utterance, is *a most evident proof that the beginning of faith itself is the gift of God.*

Instructions.

1. It is not in human power effectually to teach salvation to the hearts of men, but this is to be attributed to Divine power and grace. Thus the Psalmist, cxix. 18, *Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law;* and beautifully says Augustine, in Epist. Joan. tract. 3, *Think not that any man can learn any thing from man: if he be not within who can teach, our babbling is vain. Teachers and admonitions are as helps from without; he who teaches the heart hath his throne in heaven.* See 4, De doctr. Christ. cap. 16. And Aquin. Quæst. disp. de magist.

2. Many open the door of their ears to the Gospel, who in the mean time have the door of the heart shut and barred. See Isa. vi. 9; Mark viii. 18.

3. Prayer to God for the opening of the heart must always be coupled therefore with the hearing or reading of the word. For there is *little light, whether in the hearing or reading the word, which prayer does not enlighten,* as speaks Parisiensis, De Rhet. Div. cap. 30.

And thus ye have explained, what it is *to open a door of utterance to ministers:* namely, to give them a suitable faculty for performing this office; to give free course to the Gospel, by removing external obstacles; and, finally, to give efficacy to the same, that it may enter and penetrate the hearts of the hearers.

To speak the mystery of Christ for which I am also in bonds.] The Apostle has taught the people that it behoved them to ask from God, to give a door of utterance to ministers, that is, the faculty, liberty, and efficacy of preaching: Now he adds, that they must further ask, that it may be granted them to draw out these gifts into use and practice. For it often happens, that when God has given a remarkable faculty to many, when he has vouchsafed peaceable times for propagating the Gospel, when, in fine, he has made the undertaking of their ministry effectual in the hearts of men, yet, through indulgence and avarice, through envy and vanity, they have at length laid aside

the desire and the care of speaking the mystery of Christ. Thus Demas forsook the ministry, 2 Tim. iv. 10. They who become indolent and avaricious, stifle the gifts bestowed upon them, and for the most part cast aside the office of preaching the Gospel: they who become turbulent or vain, preach to be sure, but yet in such a manner that these latter sow discords, the former, nonsense, whilst neither speak the mystery of Christ, that is, urge not the doctrine of salvation offered to all who believe and repent through faith in Christ crucified: And this is that mystery which Paul determined alone to know and to preach, 1 Cor. ii. 2. Ye perceive, therefore, how necessary it is to pray, that ministers after they are furnished with all necessary helps, should exert these gifts conferred upon them in preaching the mystery of Christ.

Instructions.

1. We must pray not only that learned ministers may be given to us, but further, that they may be encouraged daily by God to discharge their office with alacrity and constancy: for the declension from labour to indolence is easy.

2. Ministers often fail in the work of their vocation, because the people fail in the duty of prayer for them to God. For most truly said Gregory; *Because the people are evil, utterance is taken away even from good teachers,* Hom. 12. upon Ezek. on those words of the prophet, Chap. iii. 26, *I will make thy tongue cleave to the roof of thy mouth, and thou shalt be dumb: for they are a rebellious house.*

3. Whereas Paul is urgent that they should pray to God, not that he might obtain the honours or the riches of this world, but that he might speak and preach the Gospel; we infer from thence, that nothing is to be so desired by a pious minister, as the exercise of his ministry; nothing to be so bewailed, as to be kept back from this work.

4. When he adds, *to speak the mystery of Christ,* he shews that they are but little mindful of their office, who having the faculty and the opportunity of preaching, yet rather affect to pass off their own wit, than to preach the

mystery of Christ. The people should desire to hear nothing else, the minister should preach nothing else, than the mystery of Christ, that is, the doctrine of salvation obtained through Christ.

For which I am in bonds.] These words are inserted by the way, but not unnecessarily: for they have their use, whether you look to the people, or the pastors.

1. They excite the people to love this Apostle, who, for the sake of the edification of the Church sustained so many afflictions.

2. They also stir them up to prayer for his liberation, who shews himself so desirous of their salvation, even in bonds.

3. Lastly, they excite to a true estimation of this treasure, namely, the Gospel; for the sake of which, the Apostle refuses neither bonds nor death itself.

Corollaries.

1. It is the duty of all the godly, not to shew that they are unmindful of ministers, as often as they sustain persecution for the sake of the Gospel; but to help them by their counsel, their assistance, and their prayers.

2. It behoves us to love, yea, to honour ministers afflicted for the sake of piety in a greater degree. For crowns and chains of gold do not more adorn the great ones of the world, than bonds and chains do the ministers of God: forasmuch as to suffer for Christ is the distinguished honour, with which only eminent soldiers are wont to be presented by their General. Thus in Philip. i. 29, we read: *For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake.*

Now if you regard Paul himself and other pastors, the aforesaid words have indeed their scope and utility. For they shew that Paul was not deterred from duty by these bonds or other inconveniences, but rather was thereby inflamed with a greater desire of discharging his duty; for which cause he desires their prayers so ardently.

Corollaries.

1. It behoves ministers to love their office and to value it much, not only when the Gospel flourishes, but when

both they and it are despised and trampled upon by the ungrateful and wicked.

2. They are unworthy men in this spiritual army who are reckoned slothful in it, and weary of their labour; who soon grow tired or ashamed of their function, and bring their ministry to be hated or despised in the world.

3. Hence we infer, that although preachers of the Gospel may often be subdued and afflicted, yet the Gospel itself can never be either bound or extirpated: for as Chrysostom says, *as they cannot enchain the rays of the sun, so neither can they those of the Gospel. The word of God is not bound,* 2 Tim. ii. 9.

Vers 4. *That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.*

In the last place, he wished it also to be urged in the prayers of the godly, not only that ministers might and should preach the word, but that they might do it as they ought, that is, in a suitable and the best manner. For in all duties which are rendered to God, not the mere action, but the mode of doing it is even mostly regarded. Hence that saying of Luther (as I conceive) *That adverbs have the force of verbs with God,* that is, that the Mode of doing any thing, which is designated by *adverbs,* makes more for the praise or shame of the doer, than the action itself, which is expressed in that place by the term *verb.* For as in natural things the form is more becoming than the matter, so in morals the manner is more commended than the action itself. Hence Cyprian (De sing. cler.) says, *That is not holy which appears holy, except it be performed in a holy manner.* But to come to the words themselves; this little clause, *as I ought,* embraces many things in its compass: we shall be content with these three.

1. He ought to preach the word of God freely or confidently. I think we must put this in the first place, be-

cause the Apostle, in Ephes. vi. 20, (where these things are accurately described) expressly mentions this παρρησιας, or liberty of speaking. Neither can the legitimate preaching of the word consist without this liberty; because the end of preaching is, *to cast down and subvert every thing that exalts itself against the Divine truth, or will, by the spiritual weapons of the Gospel,* as says the Apostle, 2 Cor. x. 5.

Therefore, we ought not to preach smooth things, and, from a certain cowardly fear, withhold salutary ones: but those errors and sins which especially reign even in and among the greatest, are to be reproved. So God commands, Isa. lviii. 1, *Lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgressions.* Thus the prophet Hosea freely censured the vices of the princes and priests, Chap. v. 1. Well and piously said Prosper, De vita contempl. lib. 3. cap. 23, *We ought to be more willing to restrain their enmities, who are unwilling to be amended, than to incur the displeasure of God whilst we flatter sinners.* For *they cure and heal those bitters, although they exasperate the passions,* as Clemens rightly remarks in Protrept.

Neither ought we, either in the doctrines themselves, or in the forms and modes of speaking, to accommodate ourselves to the errors of others to the prejudice of known truth: which timorous persons often do against their conscience, especially among those whom they imagine to incline some little towards the Popish errors. But this is opposed to that liberty which is required in Christian ministers; who ought not only to retain the very substance (so to speak) and possession of the truth, but even to defend its remote bounds and confines as it were. Hence the Apostle commands us to retain, not only *sound doctrine,* but also *the form of sound words.* And prudently does Gerson advise theologians *to avoid extraneous terms in the doctrine of truth,* part. 1. De exam. doctr. consid. i. For that oft repeated saying of Jerome is true, *Heresy arises from words inappropriately used.* Thus much of this παρρησια—this liberty of speaking.

2. We ought to preach the word of God constantly and diligently. So says the Apostle, Rom. xii. 7, He *to whom*

the ministry is committed, let him *wait on his ministering; he who is a teacher, on teaching:* and 2 Tim. iv. 2, *Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season,* &c.

We ought not, therefore, to be withdrawn from discharging this office, either on the ground of our own advantage, or of pleasure and ease; nay, it ought to be the most desired and fruitful gain to a minister, that by his constant labour he may win souls to Christ; this ought to be his most delightful and acceptable pleasure, that by his ministry he daily renders many pleasing and acceptable to God the Father by Christ, as the Apostle insinuates, 2 Cor. ii. 2, Col. i. 28. Some one of the Roman emperors formerly said, that *an emperor ought to die standing;* we should no less boldly declare, that *a minister of the word ought to die preaching.* Thus much of sedulity or diligence.

3. A minister ought to speak the word of God sincerely and faithfully. It concerns this fidelity not to tack human figments to the Divine word, and to thrust those things upon the people as dogmas necessary to salvation. 1 Cor. xiv. 1. For the Apostles themselves were dispensers of the mysteries of God, not maintainers of their own inventions; they helped, were not lords over the faith of Christians. And the successors of the Apostles in the ministry, if they would shew themselves faithful, ought to propagate Apostolic doctrine, not to draw out a new one: *If we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed,* Gal. i. 8. This was the opinion of all the pious Fathers: who, although they admitted the authority of the Church in determining rites, yet thought that in matters of faith it should be bound to the rule of the Scriptures alone, and to add any thing to this rule they thought to be perfidious. I will add some testimonies from the Fathers, because the perfidious Tridentines have thrust so many dogmas upon the Church, and that under an anathema, most of which (by the confession of Papists themselves) have not a firm foundation in Scripture. Hilary, lib. 6, De Trin. upon those words HEAR HIM, says, *I will hear by all means, nor will I hear any one else except him who hears him, or teaches*

him: and lib. ad Constant. he advises, *not to overstep the immutable constitution of the Apostolic faith, lest our faith should change with time, and not continue that of the unchangeable Gospel.* And Athanasius, De consiliis; *If you are disciples of the Gospel, walk in the Scriptures: if you wish to invent any thing different to the Scriptures, why do you enter the lists with us, who cannot endure to hear what is not in them?* Tertullian, De anima, cap. 1, says; *Who shall reveal what God hath concealed? It is better to be ignorant with God on our side because he has not revealed, than to flatter ourselves with the false knowledge which the presumption of man imparts.* Jerome, in Titus i. observes; *Without the authority of the Scriptures prating is not to be credited.* Augustine frequently teaches, *that no one is to be bound to believe human authority without the foundations of Scripture;* as in Epist. 19 to Jerome, and Epist. 48 to Vincent Donatist. These things may suffice to open the perfidy of the Papists.

It also concerns this fidelity, not to withhold from the people any part of the doctrine of salvation. For God gives this in command to all his ministers; *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it,* Deut. iv. 2. *If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life,* Rev. xxii. 19. And Paul on this account, when he endeavours to shew how faithfully he had conducted himself in the ministry, says, *I am pure from the blood of all men,* because he had withheld nothing from them, but *had declared the whole counsel of God,* Acts xx. 26, 27. Here, therefore, the Papists greatly sin, who plead often for the worship of images, the sale of indulgences, and the observance of their traditions; but concerning justification by faith in the blood of Christ, and other fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, they are more dumb among the people than fish. Those also among ourselves sin, who do not endeavour to imbue their people with a knowledge of all those things (at least summarily) which are necessary to be believed or done for the attainment of salvation.

Lastly, it concerns this fidelity, so to apply doctrines, warnings, and reproofs, that they may be useful to the hearers, not that they may be vain or pernicious. For arguments true and useful in their own nature, sometimes become hurtful, when they are not set forth or applied in their place. And indeed rightly writes Augustine, De bono persever. lib. ii. cap. 21, *It is the character of a treacherous physician so to make up useful medicine, that it shall not do harm, or at least no good.* And in this matter it is usual and almost customary for most ministers to deviate, and not to speak as they ought. For nothing is more usual, than among the great and noble to proclaim smooth things to the people; among the rude and common people, to bring crimes against the noble, the magistrates, and bishops. For what end, unless that all may be rendered curious and inflated with enquiring into and censuring the faults of others, but stupid and indifferent in judging and correcting their own?

But we must pray and labour not only to preach the Gospel, but to do it *as it ought* to be done by all ministers, that is, freely, diligently, faithfully. Thus much for the first part of this exhortation.

Vers. 5.

Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.

The foregoing exhortation to fervent and constant prayer having been explained, we proceed to the other, which excites the Colossians to a wise and circumspect conversation. And in treating this, there are three things to be observed.

1. The duty imposed; *Walk in wisdom.*

2. The persons towards whom this duty is especially to be discharged; *toward them that are without.*

3. The certain primary business of this requisite wisdom; *redeeming the time.*

Walk in wisdom.] To walk in wisdom is to do all things cautiously and circumspectly, as men are wont to do when they perceive that they are beset on every side with difficulties and dangers: for danger is the whetstone of wisdom. Believers in those days lived in the midst of heathens ruling over Christians themselves, and serving idols and dæmons: there was need therefore of remarkable and precise wisdom, so to keep the middle course between Scylla and Charybdis, as neither to confirm the pagans themselves in their idolatries and impiety, nor seem to oppose government and lawful power.

There are then, as it were, four primary reasons of imposing this duty in this place.

1. To look well not to cast any spot of disgrace upon that God whom they worshipped, and the religion which they professed, by living badly. For it is presumed, that servants conform themselves to the disposition of their masters. Hence the pagans, as soon as they saw wickedness committed by Christians, spake against the God himself whom they worshipped, and imputed the wickedness of private men to our religion. This was charged to the adultery of David by the prophet, 2 Sam. xii. 14, *Thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme.* Paul alleges this against the Jews, Rom. ii. 23. *Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you.* In fine, this Apostle employs this as a special incentive to integrity of life, 1 Tim. vi. 1, *That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.* Cyprian graphically describes the insult and blasphemy of unbelievers bursting forth on this account; whose words I transcribe out of his book De dupl. martyr. *Behold they who boast that they are redeemed from the tyranny of Satan, who preach that they are dead to the world, nevertheless are overcome by their lusts as well as we, whom they affirm to be yet held under the dominion of Satan. What does baptism profit them? What does the Holy Spirit profit them,*

by whose will they say they are governed? Why have they the Gospel, the Gospel, continually in their mouth, when their whole life varies from the precepts of the Gospel? Thus far Cyprian. Therefore let this primary business of wisdom be, so to walk, that our life may be an ornament, not a disgrace to the Christian profession.

2. To beware that we do not so gratify the heathen and ungodly, as to inflict a wound upon our consciences, by communicating in any manner in their superstitions. For it is the character of an idle, and moreover of an impious mind, to be led away from the Divine direction even in the slightest degree in the business of Religion, and to pass over to the adversaries' camp: neither is it the conscience of the Christian only, sinning in this manner, which it wounds, but it hardens the mind of the pagan also in his superstition who witnesses it. Hence this communication with idolaters is strictly prohibited in both Testaments. Thus in Exodus xxxiv. 15, *Thou shalt not make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land; when they go a whoring after their gods and do sacrifice unto them, and one call thee, thou shalt not eat of his sacrifice.* In 2 Cor. vi. 15, 16, it is urged, *What communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?* In Ephes. v. 11, we are enjoined to *have no fellowship with the works of darkness.*

And here it is worth while to consider the severity of the antient Church towards those who incurred the least suspicion of committing idolatry, although they had done so being compelled to it through danger of death. Diocletian, Licinius, Julian, and other idolatrous emperors, partly by fear, and partly by rewards, endeavoured to induce Christians to offer incense to their idols; as may be seen in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. lib. 8. cap. 3, and De vita Constant. lib. 1, cap. 47; and in Nazianzen, Orat. 1. in Julian. It might not seem perhaps of great moment to any one, to throw a few grains of incense into the fire, at the command of the emperor: but because this was done in honour of the idols, severe decisions were passed against

them by the Church; which may be seen in the eight first canons of the Council of Ancyra.* Tom. i. Concil. p. 293. How great a wound they inflicted upon their consciences who did this, may be gathered from that narration which we have in Nazianzen, Orat. 1, in Julian. *Some Christians were led by the gifts and subtilty of Julian to offer incense; but being presently chastised by others, and brought to penitence, they returned to the emperor; they cried out, that their hand had sinned, not their mind, that they were Christians; they insisted that he would lop off the hands which they held out to offer the incense, and that (if he wished) he might cast them into that fire which they had polluted by their idolatry.* This perturbation of conscience follows every act of idolatry in the godly: in the ungodly and carnal for the most part, obduracy succeeds, and at length an entire falling away to idolatry. Let this, therefore, be the second business of walking wisely, carefully to beware not to bring guilt upon the conscience by any idolatrous communication.

3. The third is, that they should not rashly endeavour by external force to abolish idols or idolatrous rites, since they had neither the call nor the power of aiming at such things: for this is not *to walk in wisdom,* but to act madly without any reason. Indeed, a wise man will attempt to throw down idols placed in the hearts of pagans, sooner than in temples; if he takes a contrary course, he seems to perform not so much a work of wisdom as of sacrilege. God himself prescribed this wisdom to all the godly, in Deut. vii. 1, 5; *When the land shall be given into your power,.....ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves,* &c. Hence says Augustine, De verb. Dom. secun. Matt. serm. 6, *It is the part of furious Circumcelliones*† *to be cruel where they have not the*

* This Council was held in the year 314.

† These were a set of men who sprang up amidst the religious commotions occasioned by the heresies that infected the Church in the fourth Century, especially that of the Donatists. "These unhappy commotions," says Mosheim, Vol. i. p. 406, "gave rise to a horrible confederacy of desperate ruffians, who passed under the name of Circumcelliones. This fu-

power. WHEN THE LAND SHALL BE GIVEN INTO YOUR POWER, YE SHALL DESTROY THEIR ALTARS. *Where the power is not given us, ye shall not do it. For we do it before we have thrown down the idols in their hearts.* Therefore, God requires this from them who are under the power of idolaters, namely, that they should not pollute themselves with the superstitious worship of the idols; but he does not require, that they should attempt to hinder or abolish their idolatry by external force. *Ye shall see in Babylon gods of silver, and of gold, and of wood borne upon shoulders. Beware therefore that ye be in no wise like to strangers, neither be ye afraid of them, when ye see the multitude before them and behind them, worshipping them: but say ye in your hearts, O Lord, we must worship thee.* Baruch vi. 4, &c. in that Epistle which is attributed to Jeremy. Finally, I add the example of Paul; who, when he walked among the numerous idols of Athens, did not attempt to pull them down with his hands, or to shatter them with hammers, but with reason and argument. See Acts xvii. 16, &c. to the end.

4. The last business of wisdom is, not to refuse even to unbelievers and pagans, the obedience due to them, whether by Divine or human right. Christ commanded this to all his disciples, Matt. xxii. 21, *Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are*

rious, fearless, and bloody set of men, composed of the rough and savage populace, who embraced the party of the Donatists, maintained their cause by the force of arms, and overrunning all Africa, filled that province with slaughter and rapine, and committed the most enormous acts of perfidy and cruelty against the followers of Cæcilianus. This outrageous multitude, whom no prospect of sufferings could terrify, and who, upon urgent occasions, faced death itself with the most audacious temerity, contributed to render the sect of the Donatists an object of the utmost abhorrence; though it cannot be made appear, from any records of undoubted authority, that the bishops of that faction, those, at least, who had any reputation for piety and virtue, either approved the proceedings, or stirred up the violence of this odious rabble." Africa was the theatre of the most bloody scenes, owing to the excesses of these wretches during a great part of Constantine's life. For a further account of the Circumcelliones the learned reader may consult Witsii Miscellanea Sacra, Vol. i. pp. 607—10, 4to. Lug. Bat. 1736.

God's. Paul preached this, Rom. xiii. 1, *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers.* Peter himself advised to this, 1 Epis. ii. 13, *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto govèrnors as sent by him,* &c. But all these concerning whom Christ, Paul, and Peter spake, were in that age heathens and idolaters. It is, therefore, the duty of a Christian walking wisely, even to honour heathens and unbelievers invested with power, to pay them tribute, to yield them obedience, and to do all those other things to which they are bound by laws not opposing the Divine laws. So Augustine, Quæst. V. et N. Test. quæst. 35, says, *The king is always to be honoured, if not for his own sake, yet on account of his station;* and De civit. Dei, lib. 5, cap. 19, *The power of ruling is not given to the wicked, unless by the Providence of the Most High God, when he judges human affairs worthy of such masters;* and cap. 21, *He who gave the kingdom to a Christian Constantine, he also gave it to an apostate Julian.* If even he gave the kingdom to an unbeliever, men may not withhold their obedience on account of infidelity.

2. Now, in the second place, we must speak more distinctly concerning the persons towards whom it behoves us to exercise this wisdom. And they are called *them that are without.* Under which title he denotes all not as yet admitted into the Church; as also in 1 Cor. v. 12, *What have I to do to judge them that are without?* For the Church is as a certain spiritual house: hence they who have enlisted their names under Christ, are accounted the *servants of faith:* they who have not done so, are judged to be *strangers* and *foreigners* from this family of the faithful.* Wisdom is indeed to be exhibited in our walk towards our brethren, and in like manner towards all men; but special mention is made of them that are without in this place, because there is special difficulty in that respect. And the Apostle designated (as it is said) heathens and pagans by this word, on account of the circumstances

* See Gal. iv.; Ephes. ii. 12, 13.

of those times: but inasmuch as we do not now live among them, we must use this wisdom towards heretics, towards the profane, and atheists, who usurp indeed the name of Christians, but nevertheless are altogether strangers to the true and living Church of Christ. These persons, then, are to be considered, either as they preside over or as they are subject to true and orthodox Christians.

When they preside and govern, we shall walk wisely towards them if we shall have performed those things which were explained above by us.

When they are subject, and yet are frequently conversant among the orthodox, lest they should be thorns in their eyes, there is need of manifold wisdom, both in public magistrates, and in private Christians.

1. The magistrate must exercise his wisdom towards the learned, who are as standard-bearers and leaders of the heretical faction. And it consists in this, to take care most diligently not to hold conversations upon religion with the more unlearned and simple orthodox: for although they may have the *head of the dove,* yet all have *the tail of the scorpion,* as says Bernard, Epist. 196. There is the same reason concerning the books of heretics; from the reading of which the unlearned and unstable are to be restrained, lest they should be corrupted by the leaven of their errors and heresies. See Gal. v. 9.

2. It pertains to this wisdom of the magistrate, to take care that heretics, the unlearned, and those seduced by others, be mildly and wisely informed and instructed by learned and pious men, who shall be judged fit for this business.

3. It behoves a pious and wise magistrate to employ a double care towards all these strangers promiscuously:

First, to compel them by fines and punishments, at least to attend the outward means of religion, namely, to be present at prayers, and preaching, and the celebration of the sacraments. Augustine frequently teaches this: In Epist. 48, he confesses that he was of a contrary opinion, but afterwards found by experience, that the terror of the laws and medicinal trouble are very necessary to the de-

praved and indifferent minds of many. You may find more in Epist. 50, and Epist. 204, ad Donat. et contra 2 Epist. Gaudentii, lib. 2. cap. 17. This is the first care. Secondly, that they may not be permitted to exercise superstitious rites, both contrary and repugnant to true religion. *For in this kings serve God as kings, if by virtue of their royal power they command good things, and prohibit the bad, not only things which pertain to human society, but also those which pertain to Divine Religion,* says Augustine, Contra Cresconium grammat. lib. 3, cap. 51. Augustine has also similar remarks in Epist. 50. Thus much concerning the wisdom of the magistrate towards heretics and all who are without the pale of the orthodox church.

As to what belongs to private persons, especially the rude and unlearned; this is their chief wisdom towards them that are without, to converse with them so far only as natural, moral, or civil right requires; not to enter into any intimate friendship with them, not to desire any alliance, as many are wont. For wisely says Tertullian, advers. Valentin., *As vices bred elsewhere are wont to put forth and infuse their poison into members that are near to them; so the vices of the wicked are derived to those who associate with them.* Hence to mix in marriage, or enter into friendship with idolaters, and to cleave to their errors, are judged as connected and consequences to one another by God himself, Josh. xxiii. 12. Thus much as to the persons towards whom this wisdom is to be exercised.

Redeeming the time.] In these words is expressed a particular and certain special business of this wisdom: concerning which a few things are to be added separately. *Redeeming the time,* Καιρὸν ἐξαγοράζεσθαι, is nothing else than to make the most difficult and inconvenient seasons, and adverse to our salvation, advantageous and opportune. Such were the times when Christians lived in the midst of the cruelties of idolaters; such also are now, when we live in the midst of the seductions of heretics, and profane scoffers of God and Religion. How, then, shall the godly be able to find *a seasonable time* in this *unseasonable one?* No otherwise, truly, than by redeeming

this opportunity of serving God, and consulting their salvation, which so many disadvantages seemed to oppose. But it is redeemed for the most part at a great price:

Sometimes with the contempt and rejection of all honours and secular pleasures. For always a difficulty, oftimes even ignominy and punishment, deter Christians from the path of salvation. Of this unseasonableness he makes a seasonable time to himself who, for the sake of religion and righteousness, thinks it a noble thing to despise the pleasures and delights of the world, to sustain contumely and punishments: this the Apostles and martyrs did in the primitive Church. See Acts v. 41.

Sometimes by the renouncing riches and all external good. For it was the custom of tyrants to strip and spoil the true worshippers of God of all their goods. As often as this happened, it allowed them to retain only the life of faith, all things else were exposed to their will; just as travellers were wont to give all their stores to robbers, and only bargained for their life. This Augustine has taught us, in Epist. ad Rom. propos. 74, *We must not resist magistrates, although they should unjustly take from us all our temporal goods. Ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods,* Heb. x. 34.

Sometimes at the expence of this life. For frequently the fierceness of persecution was so great, that not only was it a penal, but a capital crime to embrace the true Religion. Such times there were to Christians under many heathen emperors; Such also were the times of Mary to us; there are such times still to all the orthodox and godly under the empire of the Scarlet Whore. They who fall on these bitter times, might make blessed times of them, namely, by redeeming the occasion and opportunity of glorifying God by the voluntary pouring forth of their blood. See Acts xxi. 13. In a word; he is said *to redeem the time,* who submits himself to conditions however unjust (so that they are not unlawful) that he may cleave to God, and retain saving faith and a good conscience.

Instructions.

1. Such is the power of ungodliness and the fury of the

devil, that the godly can indeed only filch a little of the time which they consecrate to God and their salvation, unless it be redeemed for the most part at a great cost.

2. No times, however, are so adverse to the godly, and hindered by such difficulties, but the wise, who know how to redeem time, can find opportunity for glorifying God and promoting their salvation.

3. It is the part of a wise and magnanimous Christian, not to be deterred from faith or piety because the days are evil; but rather to be excited by these evils and disadvantages to constancy in the Divine worship, and the profession of the true faith: For to every business of this life, one time is convenient, another inconvenient; but for promoting the business of the future life, there is no time which may not be convenient to one who walks wisely.

Vers. 6.

Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.

The exhortation that preceded was to perseverance in prayer, and wisdom in conversation: This last member of the Apostolic exhortation excites to the use of discretion in speaking.

There are two members of this verse: 1. The exhortation itself; *Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt:* 2. The amplification of the exhortation; *that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.*

In the exhortation itself these three things must be considered: What, How long, In what manner.

1. If it be inquired what that is concerning which the Apostle labours so much in directing and instructing us; It is *Your speech.*] This it is which he endeavours to direct as it were to a certain rule. By which word, although

he seems especially to have respect to that converse which is held with infidels and pagans, yet he has respect also generally to whatever discourse Christians have with one another.

Instructions.

1. It is not sufficient to order our life and actions well, unless we at the same time regulate our words and discourse religiously. For Christians must not only live, but speak according to rule. *If any one among you seem to be religious and bridleth not his tongue, that man's religion is vain,* Jas. i. 26. Therefore away with that excuse plainly of a licentious poet,

We have a wanton escutcheon, but a chaste life.

Neither the life nor conversation is allowed to be indecorous in pious men.

2. Not only is there danger of guilt and damnation from wicked actions, but it is also incurred from wicked speeches; because we are bound to useful speech and seasoned with grace; as shall be shewn presently. And hence the Apostle calls a wicked tongue *an unruly evil,* and declares that it is *full of deadly poison,* Jas. iii. 8. *Death and life are in the power of the tongue,* says Solomon, Prov. xviii. 21. Chrysostom, Hom. 2, in Matt. observes, that most men bring injury upon themselves by their tongues. And Cyprian, lib. 1, epist. 3, notes, that among all the parts of that rich man concerning whom we have a parable in Luke xvi., the mouth and the tongue suffered the most bitter torments, *because he had sinned more with the tongue and the mouth.*

3. It is the mark of a perfect and complete Christian, to manage his discourse and his tongue rightly. Hence, after the injunction concerning perpetual prayer and a wise conversation, the Apostle subjoins, in the last place, as the height of perfection, the government of the tongue: For, says he, *if any one offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body.* James iii. 2. Ye thus have what it is which is to be regulated.

But for how long must we employ this care of our speech?

2. *Always,* says the Apostle. Not that we must always speak; for there is a time to be silent: but that when we speak, we must always take care to speak as we ought.

Here, therefore, they are to be reproved, who only speak soberly and religiously before ministers or other grave men, or when they suffer from disease; whilst in their banquets or private conversations, they think they may make use, as by a peculiar privilege, of any obscene or foolish expressions.

3. *Let it be with grace seasoned with salt.*] How our speech is to be rightly regulated, is now, in the third place, shewn; namely, if it be in a manner seasoned with grace as with salt. Hence Tremellius translates the passage a little more freely, *Let your speech be with grace, and as if it were seasoned with salt.* By *grace* and *salt* in this place we must understand that pious and religious prudence flowing from the Holy Spirit, which first directs the heart, then the tongue of the man to utter speech as he ought. This gift of grace is likened to salt on two accounts:

1. Because as salt extracts the noxious humours from meats, and banishes all putrescency from them: so the grace of heavenly wisdom represses idle and useless language in the discourse of the godly; and it altogether removes and takes away from them wicked, obscene, and impure language. *Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth,* &c. Ephes. iv. 29.

2. Because as salt not only dries up the superfluous and noxious humours of meats, but makes them much more fit to be digested, and wholesome for nutriment; so the salt of wisdom operates, not only that the discourse of Christians be not idle or noxious, but becomes more suited and useful for edification. For what is said of Solomon, Eccl. xii. 10, may be extended in a degree to all the godly, *He sought to find out acceptable words, and that which was written was upright, even words of truth.*

Instructions.

1. No discourse of Christians ought to be insipid: but

that is deemed as unsavoury, which is either hurtful, or no ways profitable.

2. It is not sufficient to season our speech with any kind of salt, but we must do it with the salt of wisdom. Therefore let that salt of satirical virulence be discarded, with which it is too much the custom with the petulant to season, or rather to embellish their conversation. Neither let us very much indulge those jocular saltings with which men of politer wit are delighted in a wonderful manner. For although I would not decide with Ambrose, that *all raillery is abhorrent to ecclesiastical rule,* and is, on that account, to be declined; yet I would affirm that the commendation of a Christian does not depend upon it; and therefore he must labour only for the salt of wisdom in his conversation.

3. They are altogether destitute of this salt, to whom it is customary and pleasant to blab out words corrupting to the mind or the affections of the hearers: for it is the property of salt to restrain corruption, not to produce it.

They corrupt the mind and judgment, who disseminate heretical, false, or ambiguous discourses, either inclining to Popery, or any other heresy. For words of this kind either impel the unskilful and unstable into error, or at least leave them doubtful in the faith.

They corrupt the will and affections, who belch forth obscene, profane, or irreligious sayings; whereby atheistical men attempt nothing else than to tear away from others also by this contagious discourse, the piety and fear of God which they themselves have cast off. But all these have not salt in themselves; but consumption, putridity, and poison, which they labour to infuse into all others.

Thus much concerning the exhortation itself; about which we have spoken the more briefly, because we have treated the same matter at the eighth verse of the preceding chapter.

That ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.] In these words he amplifies the aforesaid exhortation, by indicating the cause for sound and discreet speech, and the use of it.

That ye may know] Tremellius translates it, *And know ye.* In which words the Apostle shews the very cause or fountain of sound speech, namely, the knowledge drawn from the word of God, laid up in the mind of the speaker. For sound speech does not produce our knowledge; but knowledge causes us to use sound speech. Therefore, although in the order of nature knowledge precedes discreet speech; yet in the order of cognizance and manifestation, speech precedes and indicates knowledge. And hence it is that the Apostle in the former passage wrote, *Let your speech be seasoned with salt,* and then subjoined, *that ye may know,* &c. that is, that thence it may be manifest that ye are endowed with that distinguished knowledge which becomes Christians.

How ye ought to answer every man.] In these last words we have the fruit, the use, or application, as well of knowledge, as of wise speech; namely, *that it may be answered to every one even as it is fit:* That is, to unbelievers and pagans requiring a reason of our faith, constantly and prudently, lest we would expose our religion to ridicule; to heretics impugning the true faith, vigorously and bravely, that we may not suffer even the least particle of Divine truth to be overthrown; that we may impart saving doctrine to the ignorant, and to those enquiring after the ways of the Lord; that we may administer comfort to the afflicted, and those groaning under the burden of a wounded conscience; in a word, that to all, desiring our discourse on any account whatever, we may speak wisely and with profit.

Corollaries.

1. All Christians (under whatever title, whether Clerics or laics) must endeavour to obtain that knowledge of religion and divine things, which may guide them to render a reason of their faith. *Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you,* &c. 1 Pet. iii. 15.

2. Not only is this required from well instructed Christians; but even that they may abound in knowledge and speech, if not in more artificial, at least fruitful, and ac-

commodated also to the edification and various advantages of the brethren. This Paul extolled in the Corinthians, 2 Epis. viii. 7, *Ye abound in every thing, in faith, in utterance, in knowledge,* &c.

3. They are deservedly to be blamed, who do not apply themselves to sacred learning, which alone is wont to imbue the minds of men with this art of speaking wisely. For that salt is hidden in the word: and thence all wisdom is to be derived, which may be salutary either to the possessor himself, or to others. Hence the Apostles, being instructed in the Divine word, are called *The Salt of the earth,* Matt. v. 13. In which form of speaking, that which is the property of the Divine Word, is transferred to the persons to whom the administration of it is committed.

4. We may hence infer the cause, why almost all places every where echo with silly and insipid discourses; namely, because most men are destitute of this salt of the doctrine of the gospel, and of spiritual wisdom, whence every well seasoned speech flows.

5. Hence you will perceive with how great wickedness the Romanists surround themselves, who take away the salt of the Divine word from the people: for by that same act they impose upon themselves the necessity as it were both of thinking and speaking foolishly, to whom God gives it in command both to acquire knowledge and speech seasoned with salt to promote the advantage of their neighbours. But to those to whom either the health or the utility of their brethren is a matter of care, it behoves them to season both their mind and their speech with the salt of the Divine word: for *every one is bound to know that,* says Gerson, part. 2. in Regul. moral., *without the knowledge of which he cannot fulfill the command, and avoid sin.*

And thus we have dispatched the three-fold apostolical exhortation. Now we must pass on from the exhortations to the second part of this Chapter, namely, to the Apostolic encomiums and commendations which he bestows upon certain distinguished men.

Vers. 7, 8, 9.

All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you, who is a beloved brother, and a faithful minister, and fellow-servant in the Lord.

Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that he might know your estate, and comfort your hearts;

With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things which are done here.

The Apostle proposed some very useful and very necessary exhortations in the six foregoing verses: Those having been explained, there now remains only the commendations of certain particular men, and salutations from sundry persons. Perhaps these matters may seem of less moment to some persons; but yet they are not to be made light of: For that rule of Chrysostom is to be approved by all, *Proper Names, although they may be recited alone in the Scriptures are not to be despised,* Hom. 4. in Gen. *For like as if any one should find dry herbs, having neither fragrance nor colour that was pleasing, disposed in the officinal of the physician; however mean may be their appearance, will yet guess that some virtue and remedy is concealed in them: so in the pharmacopœia of the Scriptures, if any thing occurs which at first sight may seem to be despised by us, yet may we determine of a certainty, that there is some spiritual utility to be found in it; because Christ, the Physician of souls, we may suppose, would place nothing insignificant or useless in his pharmacopœia,* as Origen has admirably said, in Hom. 8, in Levit. Let us now come to the point, and discuss in their order, as well these commendations as the salutations following them.

In these three verses, then, which we have recited, is contained the second division of this Chapter; which is

employed to commend two distinguished men, by whom this Epistle was transmitted to the Colossians. Now three things are to be considered in these as it were commendatory letters:

1. The persons sent; namely, Tychicus, and Onesimus.
2. The causes of the mission;
   1. To make the affairs of Paul known to the Colossians.
   2. To know and look into the affairs of the Colossians.
   3. To comfort the hearts of the Colossians.
3. The commendations of the Missionaries:
   Of Tychicus; which are opened in the 7th verse.
   Of Onesimus; which are opened in the 9th verse.

We must begin with the persons; and first with Tychicus: He was of Asiatic origin, and clave to Paul as his companion in passing through Macedonia, and afterwards preceding him, he awaited him at Troas, Acts xx. 4. In the Synopsis which passes under the name of Dorotheus,* he is said to have been the first Bishop of Chalcedon. But the credit of this must rest with this author. It is certain and clear, that he was a pious man, and endowed with remarkable gifts, and employed the same to propagate the Gospel and edify the Church.

* Dorotheus flourished A.D. 303, according to Cave (Hist. Lit. Tom. 1, pp. 163. Ed. 1740), a very obscure person, of whom, therefore, the more is said. And first, he is not some other persons who have borne his name. Then the Roman and Greek martyrologies have decorated him with more honours than he deserves. He is said to have written many Ecclesiastical Commentaries, and particularly *Synopsis de vita et morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et Discipulorum Domini*, contained in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*; of the fabulosity of which Cave was convinced by a Greek fragment sent him by his friend Dodwell, and which is given at length, occupying five pages, with about two of commentary by the Literary Historian. The writer of the fragment asserts that Dorotheus wrote in Latin, and that *he* translated the work into Greek. Cave thinks it wonderfully probable, that a Greek, and a Bishop of Tyre, in Phœnicia, should write in Latin! In fact, it almost appears, that, although a Latin and a Greek work are extant and visible enough, the alleged author may be classed with the *Entia*, not *Rationis*, but *Imaginationis*.

As to the causes of his mission; the first is gathered from these words, *All my state shall he declare unto you:* that is, he shall shew you all things about which you ought to be informed. Paul was separated from the Colossians by a long distance, inasmuch as he was imprisoned at Rome, and, as it were, destined to the lions: On account of their love, therefore, towards such an Apostle, they desired doubtless to know how he did, what sufferings he was labouring under, what danger threatened him, what hope of deliverance there appeared, and other things of the kind. Therefore, willing to satisfy this so becoming a desire, he deputed Tychicus and Onesimus, who might make all these things known to them.

Hence we may observe,

1. It becomes well-instructed Christians to desire a knowledge of the prosperity or misfortune of their pastors, and to be kindly affected, and even ready to render them assistance when occasion arises.

2. Pious pastors, even afflicted and imprisoned, so conduct themselves, that it may be useful to the Church to know what they do. So this great Apostle cast into prison at Rome, and bound in chains, notwithstanding *received all that came in unto him, preaching to them the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence,* Acts xxviii. 30, 31. It is no wonder, therefore, if he who could do such remarkable things under his confinement, should wish his affairs to be known to them.

3. A Christian people, therefore, is to be blamed, to whom it is no pleasure to see the prosperity of their ministers; neither feel any sympathy in looking upon their miseries: who only care about their own things, but with regard to their ministers, what they want or what they suffer, they are no ways solicitous about. The Colossians were otherwise minded, who earnestly desired to know all Paul's concerns.

4. Ministers also are to be reprehended, who do not so conduct themselves in every condition and fortune, that it may be well for their people to know what they do and what they suffer. Of this class are they, who in pros-

perity give themselves to ease; but under the cross despond through indolence of mind, or through impatience rage against God and men, and in the mean time are intent upon no good thing. It is not to be desired that all the affairs of these men should be made known to the people, as what would be rather a scandal to them than a comfort.

That he might know your estate.] This was the second cause why Paul would send Tychicus to the Colossians. He desired not only that they might be informed about his state, but that himself also should be informed about their state. But the Apostle had respect most especially to the things pertaining to their spiritual state: For he desired to know how they were rooted in the faith, how they agreed together in love, how they observed discipline and order, and, in one word, how they adhered to their Christian profession. This knowledge is very necessary to the pastor: because the state of the people being little understood, he cannot apply to them fitly and suitably either his doctrine, or reproof, or consolation; as a physician cannot his medicines, unless he first inquire into the state of the sick man.

Many things are here to be observed and imitated by us ministers.

1. Let us observe the paternal love of Paul towards the people; who, imprisoned and appointed to death, was yet more solicitous about the affairs of others than about his own life. If he cared less for his own life than the spiritual edification of a Christian people, then it behoves us to prefer the public good of the Church which we serve to our own pleasure and private advantage.

2. Let us observe the diligence of the Apostle, who was not satisfied to disseminate the Gospel by his preaching and by his letters, but thought it even his duty to inquire into the life and conversation of men, and, as much as he could, to furnish himself with particular knowledge of each individual. Thus every minister ought to labour, not only in feeding his flock, but also in inquiring into and discerning their manners.

3. Hence let us observe the wisdom of Paul: For he

undoubtedly makes the Colossians much more solicitous about regulating their life properly, whilst he intimates that he was so solicitous to know the same. There is no doubt but even amongst ourselves, all in whom there is the least spark of shame and honesty, would live more holily, if pastors, according to their office, would endeavour to know the manners and course of life of individuals.

And comfort your hearts.] This is the last cause whereby Paul was impelled to send Tychicus. They needed consolation in a twofold respect :

1. Because, as it is very likely, they were much grieved on account of Paul's being imprisoned, of whose death, by the well known cruelty of Nero, who then ruled, they could not but daily expect the sad tidings. Tychicus, therefore, relieves the minds of the Colossians, by relating to them that this eminent Apostle not only lived and was well, but even preached the Gospel freely in his bonds.

2. They needed consolation in respect of their own infirmity: For it is too much the case to shrink from a profession of the Gospel through impending danger. For the devil and the flesh, impatient of the cross, are wont to suggest to the minds of men, that it is folly to embrace that doctrine which kings endeavour to extirpate by punishment, which the wise men of the world endeavour to subvert by various schemes. The Apostle, therefore, in order to meet this evil, and confirm them in the faith against persecutors and against seducers, sent Tychicus to establish them, and exhort them that they should not be moved by these afflictions, but be ready after his example to suffer any thing for the Gospel. See 1 Thess. iii. 2.

Hence we may learn,

1. To acknowledge the inbred evil of our nature, which causes us all to be dejected in mind as often as we perceive the cross and affliction to threaten the profession of the Gospel: for we are as that stony ground, which *receives the word with joy, but when tribulation ariseth for the word's sake is forthwith offended,* Matt. xiii. 20. Therefore, it behoves us to withstand this evil, to lift up our hearts, and to confirm them by spiritual comforts. For *this our light*

affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, 2 Cor. iv. 17.

2. A minister of the word ought not only to shew himself a pattern of constancy and fortitude in suffering, but also to animate and strengthen others by building up, consoling, and preparing them by all means to endure the cross with joy. Thus, in time past, Tertullian, Cyprian, and other pious pastors, for this end armed the Christians to submit to martyrdom by their writings: so in the days of Mary, our ministers of the Gospel consoled the hearts of their people by letters and exhortations. They, therefore, are wholly unmindful of their duty, who despise their brethren groaning and labouring under any cross whatever, whose hearts they ought to comfort and strengthen. Thus much for the causes of the mission.

A beloved brother, and faithful minister, and fellow-servant in the Lord.] Ye have heard the causes of the mission: Now let us come to the commendation of the person sent, whom the Apostle, not only in this place, but also in Ephes. vi. 21, honours with the same remarkable commendations. As to the present encomium, it consists of three members: which we shall notice the more briefly, because we have spoken in the seventh verse of the first Chapter concerning them.

1. He calls Tychicus *a beloved brother.*] All Christians were wont mutually to call one another by this name, according to the saying of Christ, Matt. xxiii. 8, *One is your Master, and all ye are brethren.* But yet it is to be supposed that Paul did it in this place, not only because of the common custom, but because of his singular love towards this man deservedly most beloved. Hence learn,

1. That brotherly love among all Christians ought to be strong, but especially among ministers of the word. *I command you that ye love one another*, said our Lord. John xv. 17. Hence says Tertullian, De patient. *Love is the chiefest bond of faith, and the treasure of the Christian name.*

2. They who bear hatred or envy towards their brethren, especially towards fellow ministers, possess nothing of the candour of Paul, nothing of Christian charity: for

that saying of the Apostle, 1 Thess. iv. 9, agrees in all the truly pious, *Concerning brotherly love ye have no need that I write unto you,* &c.

2. He is called *a faithful minister.*] A double eulogy is contained in these two words: he is extolled from his honourable office, because *a minister;* and from the faithful execution of the same, because *faithful* in the ministry.

A Minister] namely, of Christ: for he speaks not of any abject ministry, but of the ministry of the Gospel. He is therefore named *a minister* for the sake of honour. Hence learn,

1. That they are not to be reckoned among Christians who despise men, otherwise not at all to be despised, on the sole ground that they have undertaken the office of a minister. For if to be a Christian, is a glorious thing; then to be among Christians the leader of a faithful people, the interpreter of the Divine will, a preacher of heavenly things, is by far the most glorious. Hence Paul, in 1 Tim. v. 17, assigned a double honour to the ministers of the word, *let them be especially counted worthy of double honour who labour in the word and doctrine.*

2. That they are foolishly modest and unworthy the ministry, whom the profane folly of others either causes to be ashamed or to repent of so honourable a vocation. Paul was otherwise animated, who thought that he honoured Tychicus by this title of *a Minister,* and commended him to the Colossians; and who professed concerning himself, *I am not ashamed of the Gospel,* &c. Rom. i. 16. And Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 7, says, that *it is more excellent to serve God in the sacerdotal office, than to bear the pre-eminence among earthly kings.*

3. That they also even sin on the opposite side, who endeavour to transform this spiritual ministry into a temporal empire. This the Romanists do, who constitute their Pope, not a minister of the Gospel, but a temporal monarch of the whole world. Thus much of the office.

Faithful.] This adds much to the commendation of Tychicus. For inasmuch as the ministry itself is to be ho-

noured, although in a wicked man; yet dishonesty or infidelity in the discharge of this ministry, is wont, not only to alienate our minds from the minister himself, but to cast a stain even upon the ministry also.

This fidelity, which is commended in Tychicus, consists in two things: in that he always exercised his ministry both to promote the glory of God, and to advance the edification of the people of Christ.

Hence we are instructed,

1. They thrust themselves in vain into the ministry, who in discharging the same do not prove themselves faithful; nay, it is pernicious both to their own welfare and that of others: neither shall they receive the prize destined to teachers, but *that woe* directed against those who preach not the gospel.

2. It behoves pious Christians to reverence their ministers, of whatever sort they are; but highly to love the faithful, and to bear them in their eye (as they say), yea (as the Galatians did Paul) *to receive them as angels, or as Christ Jesus himself,* Gal. iv. 14.

And fellow-servant in the Lord.] This is the last particular of the eulogium of this man. Now he calls him *a fellow-servant in the Lord,* because both served the same Lord, namely Christ, by the preaching of the Gospel: they therefore could not lightly esteem Tychicus, among whom Paul was in honour, who acknowledged him for his fellow-servant.

Observations.

1. It is the common duty of all ministers, to honour their companions in the same ministry as much as they can, and to render them well-pleasing and acceptable to their people; not to excite hatred towards them.

2. It becomes those who are appointed to a more eminent station, not to despise inferior ministers, but to esteem and treat them as their fellow-servants. Thus Paul from his Apostolic eminence does not despise or depress Tychicus, much inferior to himself; but rather exalts him, and puts him as his equal, by calling him *a fellow-servant.*

3. The Roman pontiff is not the true successor either

of Paul or of Peter,* who not only would rule over all the Clergy and the whole Christian world, but even in a regal manner over kings and emperors themselves: so far is he from treating his fellow-ministers as fellow-servants.—Thus far concerning Tychicus.

Vers. 9. *With Onesimus, a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They shall make known unto you all things which are done here.*

The commendations of Tychicus being explained, the Apostle proceeds to his testimony also to Onesimus as equally to be honoured: For when, indeed, each was joined in the embassy, he thought each should also be joined in the commendation.

As to the person himself; This Onesimus (as most conjecture) was the same whom Paul had made a true Christian of a runaway slave. And hence it is that in the Epistle to Philemon, vers. 10, he glories that *he had begotten him in his bonds.* Whence Jerome, writing against the errors of John of Jerusalem, says, *We read that Onesimus, renewed amidst the bonds of Paul, was taken from a slave to be a deacon.*

Observations.

1. We should despise no one for his former misdeeds, after he shall have come to his right mind. This Onesimus was once contemptible, useless, and a runaway slave;

* The Second Section of the Decrees concerning Prohibited Books in the Index Romanum of Benedict XIV. art. 11. p. xxxiv. contains a particular condemnation of *persons* who shall dare to maintain that St. Peter and St. Paul are to be united as heads of the Roman Church, without subjecting the *latter* to St. Peter; notwithstanding the testimonies of the Fathers, as Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom, and of the historian Eusebius, to their being joint-founders of the Italian Church. The sensitive jealousy of the Apostate See upon this head is curious and significant.

but after that he yielded himself to Christ, he did not become despised of Paul, but he sends him to the Colossians with Tychicus an illustrious man, upon the same occasion of honour.

2. They therefore sin grievously, who love rather to reproach the truly converted for their former evils, than to congratulate them upon renewed health. But here we ought to imitate God himself, who is wont to estimate the dignity or utility of men, not from their past condition which they shall have cast off, but from the present which they have put on. See Ezek. xviii. 22. Thus much of the person.

He sends this Onesimus to the Colossians commended by a threefold title.

1. That he was *a faithful brother*] i. e. not only a Christian, but a true and genuine Christian: for many have assumed that name to themselves who have denied the thing itself. Hence that mention *of false brethren*, Gal. ii. 4; and that animated description of the same 2 Tim. iii. 2—4, &c. But this Onesimus was not such an one: who had not only put on the name of a Christian brother; but had performed in all things, and towards all, the duty of a faithful, true, and Christian brother. Hence we may observe,

1. It should be the endeavour of all to answer to their name and profession: For to be called and thought a Christian, a divine, faithful, or any thing of that kind, and not to be so truly, renders him a laughing-stock, does not contribute to his honour, who is loaded with false titles. Hence the angel at the Church at Sardis is censured, because *he had a name to live when he was dead*, Rev. iii. 1. For as Tertullian shrewdly says, advers. Marcion, *He to whom nature denies what is implied in the name, is mocked by the name.*

2. They are to be loved by all the pious, and (as they say) to be embraced with both arms, who are faithful, as well in their Christian profession, as in their special vocation. For, in the words of Tertullian, *as jewels obtain favour for their very rarity; so a faithful brother, a faithful*

magistrate, a faithful minister, because such are seldom found, ought to be of the highest value among all.

3. Nothing is more pernicious or more dangerous to the Church, than those perfidious brethren who feign religion, when they despise it in their heart. Paul thought these false brethren to be robbers, pagans, yea, worse than all storms and shipwrecks: Hence when he would write a catalogue of his dangers, he cites in the last place the dangers which he had undergone among false brethren, as greater than all the rest, 2 Cor. xi. 26.

2. Onesimus is commended because he had been *beloved*] Namely, by the chief Apostle Paul, who was not accustomed to receive any into intimate friendship except they were most worthy of his love. Therefore the Apostle wished them to infer hence, that this man was endowed with remarkable virtue and piety, and therefore to be beloved, as by the Colossians themselves, so by all good men.

Observations.

1. It is a sign of a good and pious Christian to be dear to and beloved by his pastor; and on the other hand, of an impious and profane person, to be hateful to the same.

2. It becomes a pious and prudent minister, to embrace those with a peculiar affection before others, whom he sees to be endued with remarkable piety. For however he is bound to take care of and to love the whole flock committed to him, yet they ought to have the pre-eminence in his love, who by holiness and probity of manners excel others: For these are *the joy* and *crown* of his ministry. Phil. iv. 1.

3. It ought to be the care of all believers, to be approved and deservedly beloved by their pastors, for their known faith and probity. They who care little about this, for the most part despise religion itself.

3. *Who is one of you.*] Lastly then, the Apostle wishes also by this consideration to render Onesimus more acceptable to the Colossians, because he was sprung from Colosse, that is to say, of their people and a countryman. For although this does not make much for the praise of

this man, yet it conduces something to inflame the Colossians with the love of him: for what is a person's own and is peculiar to him, is wont to be more loved by every one.

Observations.

1. It is proper to treat them with peculiar affection, to whom we are more near and bound in any peculiar respect; for example, if they should be of the same blood, affinity, or country with us, or of the same society.

2. That affection, therefore, is vicious, which in many begets contempt, or at least, a neglect of their own, namely, because they are of our kin. For as in things, so also in persons; the things which are produced at home are nearest to dis-esteem, but all distant and foreign things are extolled with wonderful encomiums. Christ himself experienced this folly of his own countrymen, and seriously complained of it, Matt. xiii. 57, *A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country and in his own house.* And thus much of the person extolled, and of his commendation. Now as to the cause why he also had been sent to the Colossians together with Tychicus, this he shews in these last words;

They shall make known to you all things which are done here.] Now he had said concerning Tychicus, *All my state shall he declare unto you:* But because men are wont not so firmly to believe a single witness, he would make them more certain of all his affairs by the testimony of two, that there might be no room left for doubt. It is not necessary to explain this in more words, because we have spoken of this same occasion at the seventh verse.

We have now finished the two former parts of this Chapter; the first of which consisted in exhortations; the other in commendations: The third and last part remains, which is taken up with salutations.

Vers. 10, 11.

Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas, (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him.

And Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me.

We come now to the last part of this Chapter, which contains scarcely any thing else besides certain complimental salutations sent from different persons: In running through which, because they are easy of explanation, we shall be the more brief. For we ought not either to load a plain text with too laboured a comment, or, as though we held it not worthy of our consideration, wholly to pass it by.

Three things, then, are here to be done by us. 1. We must speak concerning this duty of salutation generally. 2. We must explain so much concerning the persons sending them as will tend to shew who they are. 3. Lastly, we must speak of those eulogiums which Paul after his manner annexes in praise of every one.

Saluteth you.] As to this first thing then; this Greek word Ασπάζεται signifies either *to embrace,* which friends are accustomed to do when they return from a distance; or *to salute,* as we are used to do those whom we meet by word of mouth, and absent friends by letters, as well in our own name as that of other persons. Now this *salutation* is the auspicious prayer of health and happiness from its author God, out of a benevolent mind.

The forms of salutation are various; but all agree in this, that we salute him whom we wish all joy and prosperity from God. Christ himself most commonly was accustomed to use this form, *Peace be to you;* Luke xxiv. 36,

John xx. 19; which he also prescribed to his disciples, Luke x. 5. The Angel used this to Mary, which also was the manner of the Gentiles, *Hail, The Lord is with thee,* Luke i. 28.

But now when we salute absent persons by letters, the forms of the antients were in the beginning of their Epistles, *grace, prosperity;* at the end, *farewell.* But the Apostles in each case, instead of these obsolete salutations, employed that more holy and august mode, *Grace be with you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ;* or at least one like to it and equivalent. Therefore *to salute,* under whatever form it be done, is to wish these blessings to another from God the fountain of all good things.

That this duty of kindly saluting others is not to be neglected by a pious and Christian man, but is to be performed as well to those present as to the absent (when occasion offers) is manifest in different ways:

1. From the command of Christ our Saviour; who bids us to perform this duty, Matt. x. 12, *Into whatsoever house ye enter, salute it,* &c.

2. From the example of Paul and of the saints; who (as is plain both in this place, as well as in almost all his Epistles) was not accustomed to be unmindful of these salutations.

3. From their use and manifold utility: For they not only express and declare the mutual charity which ought to flourish among Christians, but they nourish and increase it. Moreover, when they flow from a heart purified by faith and inflamed with love, they are acts pleasing to God, and bring down the wished-for blessing (as often as sought) upon the brethren. Lastly, if they are designedly neglected, it either argues hypocrisy, or that love is very cold and languishing; from even the suspicion of which it behoves all Christians to be free.

But here it may be objected; these salutations seem to be prohibited, as idle ceremonies, and to be held in contempt by those who are engaged. When Elisha sent his servant to raise the son of the widow, he forbad him either

to salute others, or to answer those saluting him, 2 Kings iv. 29. Christ himself also, when he sent his disciples to preach, said, *Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes; and salute no man by the way,* Luke x. 4. If it be frivolous to salute those whom we meet with words, then it will also be frivolous to salute absent persons by letters.

We answer, that these phrases are tropes and hyperboles; and that the force of the words is this, to forbid us to contrive by the way, or to do any thing which may retard the business we have undertaken. Both, therefore, would mean, that we must even abstain from salutations, if perchance they might hinder the execution of the office consigned to us; but absolutely to forbid these duties of humanity, was not either the mind of the prophet, or of the Saviour, in the words cited. Hence observe,

1. That external duties of humanity, which make for the increase of charity, are diligently to be performed by pious men. Hence Augustine blamed the inhumanity of those who neglected these things: *If any one should not salute him whom he may meet, he will not be accounted a man by the traveller, but a post, or a statue of Mercury.* Serm. 42. de sanctis.

2. That they are to be performed not only in conformity with mere custom, but from love and true charity. For he incurs the guilt of a hypocrite and liar, who salutes him by word to whom from his soul he wishes not health and prosperity. So Judas saluted Christ, whom he went about to kill, *Hail, Master!* Matt. xxvi. 49.

3. That they sin, who would have this duty of Christian charity to serve their pride and ambition. So the Pharisees of old, whom on this account the Saviour rebukes, because *they loved salutations in the market places:* so the great ones among the heathen, who exacted this from their dependents. Hence the poet (Mart. lib. 3, epig. 36) complains of Fabian; he commands (says he) more than what is just,

Horridus ut primo semper te manè salutem,
Per mediúmque trahit me tua sella lutum.

4. That they both act basely, who seek their own advantage by works of charity, and instead of the duty of salutation perform one of adulation. In this they sin, who neglect others, and by these offices of humanity court the great alone, and those from whom they expect gain. But they who are truly godly and Christians, act otherwise: They render all these things, not out of false pretence, not for empty pride, not for deceitful craft, but as expressive of the true charity and mystical union which there is between the faithful.

Aristarchus.] This Aristarchus was a Macedonian, born at Thessalonica, the inseparable companion of Paul, and partner of almost all his dangers. He travelled together with the Apostle through Macedonia, Greece, and Asia, and accompanied him even to Rome. Hence in Acts xix. 29, he is called, *Paul's companion in travel.* And in xx. 4, he is mentioned among those who accompanied the Apostle into Asia. Lastly, in the Epistle to Philemon, ver. 24, he is placed among the number of those who ministered to the Apostle imprisoned at Rome.

Therefore, in praise of this distinguished man that one circumstance is alleged, that he was *the fellow-prisoner* of Paul. Which word properly denotes his being overcome and taken by the sword, and therefore the slave of his conqueror by right of war. But the expression is figurative. For Paul calls himself a captive, not because he had become a captive by right of war, but because he had been treated as a captive and slave by the adversaries of the Gospel, by being thrown into prison and loaded with chains. But now he calls Aristarchus *his fellow-prisoner,* or (as Ambrose reads it) *the companion of his captivity,* because for the love of Paul he had scarcely ever departed from his side; but was with him, and ministered to him, even in prison and bonds.

Hence infer,

1. That there is nothing more glorious to the faithful, than to suffer persecution for the sake of righteousness and the Gospel. Hence Paul was not ashamed either of

his captivity or bonds, but by way of honour calls himself and this Aristarchus also fellow-prisoners.

2. That they are to be accounted, both by the judgment of God himself, and of the Church, companions of the same sufferings with prisoners and martyrs, who are wont to aid them and bear the burden and heat out of charity: for in this respect this Aristarchus is deemed the fellow-prisoner of Paul. This much of Aristarchus.

And Marcus] Called also *John*, in Acts xii. 12. He had a pious and religious Mother, Mary of Jerusalem: in whose house the Apostles and other Christians were accustomed to meet for prayer, preaching, and other spiritual exercises; as may be gathered from the same place. Mark was esteemed the most celebrated as well for many other things, as especially for being the writer of a Gospel, which he had learnt from Peter, as Eusebius writes, lib. 2. Hist. eccl. cap. 24; and Irenæus, lib. 3, advers. hæres. cap. 1.

Hence also he deservedly obtained an illustrious name in the Church of God, because he moreover helped the apostles in preaching: for Eusebius, lib. ii. cap. 16, writes, that the churches through all Egypt were founded chiefly by his labour. Dorotheus in his Synopsis relates, that he was first Bishop of Alexandria, and was there honoured with the crown of martyrdom under Trajan. Jerome also, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, states that he was buried in the same city.

When, or by whom he was converted to the Christian faith, is not expressly stated in the Scriptures: but it is very probable that he was converted by Peter. The following considerations make this credible: 1. Because Peter was wont to frequent the house of his mother for the sake of prayer and preaching, as was before shewn from Acts xii. Therefore it is very likely that he was enlightened by him. 2. Because the antients, viz. Irenæus and Eusebius, relate, that he derived the Gospel history from Peter. Hence Irenæus calls him *the disciple of Peter*. 3. Because Jerome, in Isa. lxv. broadly affirms, that *Paul converted Timothy, Luke, and Titus;* but *Peter*, this *Evangelist Mark*. This Peter himself also seems to have indicated clearly

enough, in Epis. 1. cap. v. vers. 13, where he calls this Mark *his Son:* yet he was not his natural, but his spiritual son, begotten by the seed of the word. But now let us examine those things which are hinted by the Apostle himself.

In the first place, then, he dignifies this Mark by a surname; *Sister's son to Barnabas.*] This Barnabas was an old and celebrated disciple of Christ, as appears from Acts i. 23 (see also iv. 36); where, when a consultation was held about choosing another in the vacant place of the traitor Judas, this Barnabas, or Barsabas, and Matthias, were appointed candidates of this apostolic dignity. But in Acts xi. 24, he is distinguished by a brief but remarkable eulogy, *He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.* Therefore it was honourable to Mark to be so nearly related to such a man.

Secondly, Mark is also dignified by the testimony and command of Paul himself. For the Apostle (as it seems) had commanded the Colossians before, that they should receive this Mark honourably, if he should at any time visit them: which is more expressly stated in some copies, where it is read δέξασθαι, not δέξασθε, *ye received a commandment, to welcome him,* So Ambrose regards it: and Calvin prefers this reading, as what plainly indicates what that command had been.

But it may be enquired, what reason or necessity was there for this command. Did Mark need commendatory letters? Or, if Paul had not given this in command, would he have been rejected by the Colossians, if at any time he had gone to preach to them?

We answer, It appears from Acts xv. 38, that some displeasure had happened between Paul and Mark, from the circumstance that Mark had left him in Pamphylia, and had not continued his companion in the office of preaching. This perhaps had been made known to the Colossians: he might, therefore, have been accounted for a deserter, unless Paul, rendered in a manner more content, had commanded them about receiving him. For howsoever he had departed from Paul, yet it is very likely he

had not in the mean time ceased from the office of preaching, but had preached in other places. Hence conclude,

1. That the relatives of distinguished men are on this very account to be honoured, if they are not themselves degenerated.

2. That upright and industrious ministers are to be commended diligently to all by those who preside in the Churches.

3. If there shall be a slight error in any matter, that ought not to occasion a lasting prejudice to the offender; after he shall have amended himself.

4. Ministers ought not to exercise lasting enmities; but if at any time any cause of anger shall happen between them, as soon as it can be done, all remembrance of it should be obliterated from their minds. Thus Paul, who, heretofore displeased, had rejected Mark, being now reconciled, commends the same man to the Colossians, and most diligently guards against his being rejected by them.

Vers. 11. *And Jesus, which is called Justus; who are of the circumcision: These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me.*

This verse connects with the foregoing, in which the Apostle had saluted the Colossians in the name of Aristarchus and Mark; in the third place he adds this illustrious man. We have here to consider, 1. The person in whose name he salutes the Colossians, *Jesus Justus;* and, 2. The commendations which he bestows upon him, not individually, but common to him with Mark and Aristarchus.

Now these three are extolled,
- From their nation; because they were Jews.
- From their work; and that of a twofold kind,
  - preaching,
  - comforting.

Jesus who is called Justus.] It is likely that he was the person who welcomed Paul into his house at Corinth, when he was rejected by the other blaspheming Jews. For thus Luke writes, Acts v. 5—7. *When Paul preached that Jesus was Christ, the Jews which dwelt at Corinth opposed themselves, and blasphemed; but he shook his raiment, and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; and he entered into a certain man's house named Justus, one who worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue.*

This surname seems to have been assigned him, because he had been always most observant of justice and equity. We read that this same surname was given to some others, as to James Alphæus, who is called James Justus; concerning whom Eusebius has many things, lib. 2. cap. 1, and 23. This surname is also affixed to Barsabas, Acts i. 23. As to this Jesus Justus; there is neither any mention made (that I recollect) elsewhere in the Sacred Scriptures, nor does any thing occur in Eusebius; unless this be the same Justus whom he reckons third Bishop of Jerusalem, lib. 3. Hist. eccl. cap. 29. Thus much of the person.

Who are of the circumcision.] He now conjointly extols both this Justus and those two named above. And they are commended from their nation, namely, that they were sprung from Jewish parents; which is marked by the adjunct *of the circumcision.* And this so much the more contributes to their praise, because the rest of the Jews for the most part, as well at Rome, as in other places, were most bitter enemies of the Apostles and of the Christian religion: yea (as Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, writes) *The Jews were they who every where stirred up the heathen against the Christians, uttering the most odious lies against us and our Religion.* They, therefore, are here deservedly praised, who not only had cast off this inward malice of the Jewish race against Christ, but had put on Christ himself, and promoted the Christian Religion together with Paul and the other believers.

Here observe; It is not always safe in the business of Religion to follow the major part, or obstinately to retain national opinions. For they who were of the circumcision,

for the major part opposed Christ, and superstitiously contended for their ceremonies : yet these three persons feared not to forsake the errors of their nation.

These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God.] He now begins to commend them from their most commendable work, to which they had diligently applied themselves with the Apostle; namely, the furtherance of the Gospel.

Now he calls the Gospel *the kingdom of God*, because by this men are introduced into the kingdom of God; namely, the kingdom of Grace in this life, that they may hereafter be introduced into the kingdom of glory in the life to come. It is not unusual in the Scriptures for the propagation of the Gospel and the erection of the Christian Church to be called *the kingdom of God*. And this form of speaking has respect to those two promises heretofore made concerning the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah, who was about to erect a Divine and spiritual kingdom by the sceptre of the Word, and to administer it in the hearts of believers. Hence that record in Matt. iv. 23, *And Jesus went about all Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom ;* and in Mark iv. 11, *Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God*; and that of John, Matt. iii. 2, *Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.* These alone, then, of the Jews that were at Rome remained as helpers of Paul in promoting and administering this spiritual kingdom.*

Corollaries.

1. Although very many every where draw back from their duty, yet it becomes the pious minister to persevere, even alone, in propagating the Gospel.

2. Nothing can be thought more honourable than this office of the Gospel minister. For if they are to be accounted honoured who administer earthly kingdoms under earthly kings, with how much more honour are they to be

* "This is generally and justly urged, as absolutely conclusive against the traditions of the papists, that the Apostle Peter was at this time bishop of Rome, where he resided twenty-five years !" Scott, in loc.

treated who conduct the spiritual kingdom under Christ, the spiritual King.

3. Nothing can be more miserable or more mad than the enemies of the Gospel: because they oppose the kingdom of God itself, which they cannot overcome; and, as if they endeavoured to establish the kingdom of Satan, which will be overturned, together with all the favourers of it.

Which have been a comfort unto me.] Παρηγορειν, signifies either *to exhort*, or *to comfort*. The Apostle therefore intimates, that these three men in each respect, as well in the work of exhorting, as of comforting, proved themselves constant fellow-helpers: They exhorted him to endure the cross patiently; they comforted him by visiting him, by condoling with him, by ministering to his necessities; finally, they omitted nothing which could smooth or mitigate that miserable condition of Paul now in prison.

Instructions.

1. The wisest and the best of men under the cross need the exhortations and consolations of the godly. This the royal Prophet confesses, and in Ps. lxix. 20, bitterly complains that all had failed in this duty to him; *I looked for some to take pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none.*

2. It is a singular mark of the godly and truly faithful, to assist the afflicted, both by word and deed, and thus by the diligent employ of every duty, to refresh and comfort them. Thus Paul describes true saints; *Distributing to the necessity of saints; Rejoicing with them that do rejoice, weeping with them that weep,* &c. Rom. xii. 13, 15.

3. They, therefore, have nothing of Christian charity in them, who regard not the miseries and griefs of others, so that they themselves enjoy ease and pleasure. Of this sort were those at whom Amos directs his most pungent reproof, vi. 4, &c. *Ye lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch yourselves upon your couches,* &c. *but ye are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph.*

And so far the salutations and commendations of those three who were *of the circumcision*, that is, of the Jews:

Three others follow from among the Gentiles; Epaphras, Luke, and Demas.

Vers. 12.

Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Epaphras saluteth you.] Let us consider the person himself, and what things are attributed to this person in this place, whereby he is rendered more acceptable and commendable to his Colossian brethren.

This Epaphras was the Minister of the Colossians, and sent at this time to the Apostle, to refer to him the state of that Church, to assist him in his ministry, and learn his opinion about the controversies with which that Church was agitated. For so the Churches were accustomed to resort to the Apostles as oracles, even at the remotest distance. For this purpose it is most likely Epaphras was sent. Of the praises of Epaphras we have spoken at the seventh verse of the first Chapter. We shall therefore now notice those only, which are here expressly alleged by the Apostle, in order that he might procure for him more kindness and esteem among the Colossians.

He is commended to them in a threefold manner:
- From being their countryman; *one of you.*
- From his eminent office; *a servant of Christ.*
- From his sincere love towards them; *always labouring fervently for you,* &c.

1. *Who is one of you.*] That is, your fellow-citizen, born and educated among you, and finally given and devoted to your advantage. This especially conduces to

conciliate love for him. For *all love* (as the Schools express it) *is founded in some communication or participation of the same thing:* therefore, they who are participants of the same country and city, are united together as by a certain closer bond of love. For as their native soil is used to be dear to all, so it renders all things which spring from it even more dear to the wise and sober.

Corollaries.

1. They are deservedly to be blamed as vain and *void of natural affection,* who despise their own kindred and all their home concerns, being in the mean time addicted beyond what is just and good, to things and persons foreign to the house.

2. They who by a participation of country and city, or any like cause, are united with us, all other things corresponding, ought to be more dear than strangers. Hence says the Apostle, 1 Tim. v. 8, *If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.*

2. *A servant of Christ.*] Now he extols him from the dignity of his office. For by *a servant of Christ,* he does not denote a Christian in general; but one appointed to a more eminent place in this service of Christ, namely, to that distinguished and sacred function of the ministry of the Gospel. For although we are all servants of Christ, yet this appellation is frequently attributed by way of eminence to the ministers of the word. Thus Paul, in Rom. i. 1, describes himself as *a servant of Jesus Christ:* so James, Chap. i. vers. 1; and so the other Apostles.

Hence a Christian people may learn,

1. That Ministers are not to be despised as ministers, but under Christ their Lord, are to be acknowledged as set over other Christians, according to that word of the Apostle, *We intreat you, brethren, to know them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord,* 1 Thess. v. 12. Therefore ministers serve their Lord Christ; but in Christ they are set over others, or at least ought to be preferred to them from dignity of office.

2. Ministers also may hence learn, what is most espe-

cially required from them in the discharge of this sacred ministry: Not to please men; *If I please men,* says the Apostle, Gal. i. 10, *I should not be the servant of Christ*: not to be studious to promote their own advantage or honour; but to prove themselves the servants of Christ. Now he serves Christ the best, who chiefly labours that he may bring very many to the knowledge and obedience of Christ.

3. *Always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect,* &c.] Lastly, he desires that Epaphras may be rendered acceptable to the Colossians from his remarkable love towards them. This he sets forth and proves in a twofold manner: by its effect, in this verse; by his testimony, in the thirteenth verse.

Now here three things occur to be observed: 1. The effect itself of love; *prayer.* 2. The manner of the prayer; which is expressed *by always labouring fervently.* 3. The matter of the prayer; *that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.*

1. As to the first, namely, the effect of love; true love cannot flourish towards any one in the heart, without putting itself forth in some work. For among all the affections, love is the least accustomed to be inactive: which is no less true of holy and chaste, than of that inconstant and lascivious love, of which the poet speaks,

Sed malè dissimulo; quis enim celaverit ignem,
*Lumine qui semper proditur ipse suo?**

But now among the many operations of sincere love, none is more useful to the beloved, none more accordant to the minister, than this prayer whereby he pleads for the protection of God, and keeps off the plots and power of their spiritual foes from his flock. And on this account, although the Apostle could have named many other effects, from which he could have proved the love of Epaphras towards the Colossians, yet he wished chiefly to insist upon this work of prayer.

* .....But I dissemble badly;
For who can e'er that fire conceal,
Which by its own light itself betrays?

Hence let us observe,

1. The especial duties of a minister; namely, to teach his flock, and to pray for it: For *prayers are the weapons of the priest*, as Ambrose heretofore remarked. *We will give ourselves to prayer, and to the ministry of the word*, Acts vi. 4.

2. The duty lies upon the minister, not only of praying publicly for the people committed to him, but privately, and that even mostly as often as he shall happen to be absent from his flock; this we are taught by this example of Epaphras. Thus much concerning the effect itself, namely prayer: Now concerning the mode.

2. *Always labouring fervently.*] In these words he shews of what kind was this prayer of Epaphras for the Colossians; namely, constant, and also fervent. That word *always*, παντοτε, indicates the constancy: as though Paul had said, that the distance of place had not induced forgetfulness of his flock in the mind of Epaphras; but that he, though then dwelling at Rome, was no less mindful of them in his daily prayers, than when present with them he looked on them personally. But that word *labouring fervently*, αγωνιζομενος, which intimates a contest, and as it were a wrestling with God himself, shews earnestness and fervor. For as Jacob of old wrestling with God would not let him go, without the blessing sought from him; so this godly minister strove daily with God, and urged him in a manner more vehemently to bless the Colossians.

Hence observe, it is the duty of a pious minister, not out of form or custom, but from real inward love, to pray God for the welfare of his flock. But of this we have spoken in the second verse.

3. *That ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.*] This is the matter, or sum of the prayer: and here he desires for them three chief blessings; a true and perfect knowledge of the Divine will, true and perfect obedience to it, and final perseverance in each: for this is the meaning of the phrase ινα στητε, *that ye may stand*. As to the two former; both are implied and contained in that petition, *that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God*. For no one is perfect and complete in all the will

of God, except he who both knows the will of God, and studies to perform it with all his might. For the will of God is, that we may know those things which he has revealed for our salvation; it is also the will of God, that we should do those things which he commands to be done in obedience to him. Of the knowledge of the Divine will the Apostle thus speaks in Ephes. v. 17, *Be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is.* Of obedience to it, the Saviour, in Matt. vii. 21, says, *Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.* And these are two great blessings. The third blessing which he supplicates for the Colossians is perseverance in the aforesaid perfection. And rightly indeed: for he alone *who shall have persevered* in good, *shall be saved,* Matt. xxiv. 13. *All your past actions go for nothing if what you began has not been brought to perfection,* says Cyprian, De bono patient.

Instructions.

1. We should pray God for those to whom we wish well, not that they may have either the riches or the honours of this world, but knowledge and obedience to the Divine will.

2. We must beware that we are not contented with either bare and useless knowledge, or a certain blind obedience: for neither will render us *perfect and complete in the will of God.*

3. Perseverance in good is a special gift of Divine grace: For *if it were from man, we should not be obliged to seek it from God,* says Augustine, De corr. et grat.

But here a doubt arises, about the knowledge and fulness of the Divine will: For since Epaphras prays that the Colossians may stand *perfect in all the will of God,* it may be asked, whether a perfection of this kind can fall to the Christian in this life?

It is answered, That absolute perfection is not to be found in our pilgrimage here; yet we must always attempt and aspire after it, Christ being the author, who teaches us to pray, *Let thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.*

What is therefore found in the saints, is a certain imperfect perfection, as well of knowledge as of obedience. But this includes a knowledge of the will of God sufficient and necessary for their state here, the purpose and desire to fulfil and perfect it, and constant progress in faith and godliness. Therefore it excludes brutish ignorance, hypocrisy, obstinacy, gross negligence, and those other evils which oppose the Divine will. Concerning this, Augustine, Cont. duas Epist. Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 5, writes, *There is a certain perfection according to the measure of this life, and it is to be ascribed to this perfection, that any one knows that he is not yet perfect.*

Vers. 13.

For I bear him record, that he hath a great zeal for you, and them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hierapolis.

That which in the former verse he demonstrated from the effects, he now endeavours to confirm by his own testimony; namely, that Epaphras was most desirous of their benefit and salvation: as though he would say, What was before said by me, that Epaphras, on account of his singular love, always laboured earnestly for you in prayer, I would not have you think that I affirmed it from uncertain conjectures alone, but that I declared it to you from most certain knowledge.

We shall here notice three things; the witness himself; the testimony exhibited to Epaphras; the cause of giving the testimony.

1. *For I bear him record.*] The witness, who testifies the love and desire of Epaphras towards the Colossians, is the most substantial and powerful beyond exception, namely, Paul himself. Hence we may observe,

1. It is the duty of those who preside over the Church,

when occasion offers, to honour and commend by their testimony, all those whom they perceive to have discharged their ministry honestly and faithfully.

2. To pay attention to ministers, that they may in every way render clear and evident to all, that love and care for the flock, by which they deserve so honourable a testimony.

2. But now what was this testimony of Paul exhibited to Epaphras? *That he hath a great zeal for you,* &c. The Greek word for *zeal* is derived from a word which signifies *to grow hot,* or *to boil up* as water being heated is wont to do. The Apostle therefore would intimate, that this love in Epaphras was no languid and ordinary love, but a fervent and vehement one, as well towards his Colossians, as also towards the Laodiceans and Hierapolitans their neighbours.

As to these cities; Pliny, Hist. Nat. lib. 5. c. 29, calls Laodicea, *a most celebrated city,* and writes that it was *situated upon the river Lycus,* and formerly called *Diospolis.* Hierapolis was near to this. In the year after the death of Paul, historians write, that both Colosse and Laodicea were destroyed by an earthquake. And for many ages afterwards it appears that the whole country of Asia Minor, in which these Churches formerly flourished, was seized and subverted by Mahometan superstition and Turkish tyranny.

Corollaries.

1. The fervor of charity, and zeal for the salvation of their brethren, ought to grow strong in all Christians, but especially in ministers; of this, Paul himself afforded an illustrious example, Rom. ix. 3. For the coldness of love shews the abounding of iniquity. Matt. xxiv. 12.

2. This love, and this desire of promoting the salvation of others, not only extends itself to that particular Church in which we live, but to all those other churches of Christ, with which we are joined in the unity of the faith and of the Spirit. What therefore Paul said through apostolical authority, that every one may say from Christian charity, *The care of all the Churches cometh upon me*

daily, 2 Cor. xi. 28. For it behoves us to testify our desire and love for all, at least by praying for them.

3. Although the Church of God is perpetual, yet the household of the Church in particular places or countries, is not certain, fixed, and perpetual. That is perceived from hence, because these celebrated churches mentioned in this place, have long since passed away.

4. Therefore we should avoid their example, lest through contempt of the Gospel, or our lukewarmness, the same should happen to us which God, having long since threatened to these Asiatic Churches, it is plain has already done. For thus he addressed the Church at Ephesus, Rev. ii. 4, 5, *Thou hast left thy first love; except thou repent, I will remove thy candlestick out of its place.* He also threatened the Laodicean Church in the same manner, Chap. iii. 16, *Because thou art lukewarm, I will spew thee out of my mouth.*

But let us come to that which, in the last place, we proposed to explain, namely, why Paul took such diligent care that the Colossians should have a clear view of the love of Epaphras: for it is not credible that the most prudent Apostle would confirm a matter of small moment so religiously with his testimony.

This then was done, 1. That he might procure for Epaphras the greatest possible kindness and the highest respect among his people. For it is natural to men, to love and make much of those whom they consider to be desirous of their's before that of others. But it behoves a people to be affected in this manner towards faithful pastors: *Let those who rule well, be accounted worthy of double honour,* 1 Tim. v. 17.

2. Paul acted so seriously, that he might consult the benefit of the Churches themselves. For the greater favour and veneration the teachers are in, the greater benefit is wont to result to the hearers: for they willingly attend to his instruction, of whose desire and love towards themselves they have no doubt.

3. Whilst he narrates the desire of Epaphras for the welfare of these Churches, he thereby hoped, that he

might render every one among them more solicitous about his own salvation. For shame will not suffer him to sit idle who sees another labour in his concerns so earnestly. For these reasons, therefore, the Apostle made known to these churches the desire of Epaphras; and for the same reasons it behoves all ministers to take care, that their desire also for procuring the salvation of their people should be known.

Vers. 14.

Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you.

As to these two persons; he who is named in the first place (if we believe the antient Fathers) is that celebrated Evangelist, *whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the Churches;* and who *was chosen by the brethren, as the companion of Paul's travels,* 2 Cor. viii. 18.

That this Luke was by profession a physician, by birth a native of Antioch; that he lived single eighty-four years, and at length was buried at Ephesus and translated under Constantine to Constantinople, is gathered from the Synopsis of Dorotheus, and Jerome's Catalogue.

The Apostle in this place bestows upon him no other eulogium, than that he calls him *the beloved physician.* Whilst he acknowledges that he was *beloved* to himself, he affords a testimony to his virtue and piety: for the Apostle was not accustomed to bestow special and familiar love, except on account of faith and integrity clear and illustrious. He is called *a physician* from the art which he had before exercised; so Matthew the Apostle is also called after his conversion *a publican,* Matt. x. 3. For *from a physician of bodies, he was now made a physician of souls; whose writings as often as they are read in the Churches, so often Divine prescriptions are offered to men;* as Jerome well remarks, in Epist. ad Philem. Some have doubted,

whether he who is in this place called *the physician*, was the same with Luke the Evangelist; and seem rather to incline to the contrary opinion, upon the weight of this one argument, that the Apostle had bestowed upon him no honourable title. But this conjecture is too slender to set aside the common opinion which we derive from the more antient Fathers, Jerome, Ambrose, Theodoret, and almost all the rest. Neither is it necessary, that as often as mention is made of noted men, so often they should be signalized by some honourable title. Add to this, that it appears from the antients, that this Evangelist was at first a physician; nor can another person of his name be found in Ecclesiastical history who was a *work-fellow* with Paul, and *a companion* of his travels. Thus much of Luke.

And Demas.] This Demas in the Epistle to Philemon, is reckoned among the companions and fellow-helpers of Paul, vers. 24. *There salute thee, Marchus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers.* But the same person, in 2 Tim. iv. 10, is accused, because *he had forsaken Paul, having loved this present world, and departed into Thessalonica.* Dorotheus, in his Synopsis, shews the cause, that is to say, to become there an idolatrous priest. He had perhaps observed that ministers of the Gospel, like soldiers, were at once oppressed by labour and want; he therefore betook himself to exercise the priesthood among the idolatrous heathen, where a greater hope of tranquillity and profit shone upon him. The Apostle dignified him by no title; therefore it is not necessary that we should say more about him: we shall only elicit these observations;

1. That many greedily embraced the Gospel at the beginning, whom nevertheless afterwards either the fear of persecution or the love of the world hurried away.

2. That the root of true faith and piety never was in the hearts of those persons; according to that saying of John, 1 Epist, ii. 19, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us,* &c. So Cyprian writes, Lib. 1. epist. 3, *That the Church which believes in Christ, never departs from him;*

and that they are the Church who continue in the house of God.

3. Hence we gather what they are, who, having abandoned their ministry, flee from us to the Papists, to become Baalitish priests: namely, they are such as this Demas was, whom either envy, or the love of the world, that is, the desire of honour or riches, besotted.

Vers. 15.

Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house.

Because Paul wished this Epistle to be transmitted to the Laodiceans, and publicly read in their church, he prudently judged that they also should be saluted, lest it should seem that there was either little remembrance of, or little kindness in his mind towards them. For it is wise and useful to declare our love and good will towards those to whom we can communicate it, whom we would endeavour to instruct and direct by our exhortations or our advice; because all are wont more readily to obey those, by whom they believe that they are loved.

Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea.] This general and promiscuous salutation, has respect to all who had assumed the Christian name and profession in that city. Hence we may observe,

1. That brotherly love and affection ought plainly to flourish among all Christians. The philosophers of old said, *that a wise man was a friend to a wise man, although unknown:* But we may say, that a Christian is a brother to a Christian, although unknown; yea, he is more united than any friend or brother: for there ought to be *one heart and one soul* of all believers. Acts iv. 32.

2. That this brotherly love is not only declared by words, but by services, as often as brethren, even they

who live in remote churches, need our assistance. For to salute one by word as a brother, and, when occasion offers, not to promote the welfare of a brother, is the work of derision rather than of love.

And Nymphas.] Now he joins a special salutation, on account of the special and distinguished piety of this man, as may be gathered from the following verses. For it is right to assign extraordinary honour to those, whose virtue appeared and shone in the Church surpassing all others.

In the Commentaries which pass under the name of Ambrose, a comical error has found its way: For they have transformed this pious and renowned man into a woman: For thus he is there treated of; *He esteems Nymphas more dear than others, whose whole house he even salutes. For she is said to have been so devoted, that her whole house was marked by the sign of the cross.* But since the Greek is τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῆς, I cannot believe that Ambrose, or any other Greek scholar could err so childishly. In my opinion therefore, those latter words have been taken into the text by some ignorant and lazy Monk, who, according to the custom of his age, as soon as he heard the name Church, dreamed about painted crosses. Both the manifest barbarism of the words, as well as the entire want of likelihood of the thing itself, induces belief in this conjecture. For in that first and golden age of the Christian Church, the Cross of Christ depicted not upon walls, but in their breasts, indicated their devotion: neither is it probable that any wise man would, by painting this sign of the cross through his whole house, openly betray himself and others who were accustomed to assemble in his house, to the heathen at that time raging, and the Christians for the most part holding their sacred assemblies in the night. But this perhaps is too much about a thing of no great moment; only I wished to vindicate Ambrose from the impertinences of some obscure fabricator of absurdities. Let us proceed.

And the Church which is in his house.] These words may be explained in a twofold manner: For they denote either the assembly of Christians who were accustomed to meet

in the house of this distinguished man, for exercising sacred duties, that is, for prayer, for preaching the word, and the celebration of the sacrament; or they denote his private family, which for its religious sanctity merited this illustrious name of *Church,* Rom. xvi. 5. So Theodoret thinks, who thus writes on this passage, *He made his private family a Church, adorning it with piety and religion.* Neither do I perceive that any disadvantage follows, if we unite both, and say, that the house of this man was called *a Church* by the Apostle, as well because the congregation of the faithful was accustomed to assemble in his house, as because he instructed all his domestics piously and in a Christian-like manner, and trained them daily in religious exercises.

Instructions.

1. Every collection of believers, although on account of its smallness they may be included within the walls of a private house, and although on account of the fury of their enemies, they meet in nocturnal assemblies, is a true Church, and a living member of the universal Church.

2. The Papists therefore err, who acknowledge no Church unless that which has sovereignty, and ever before the eyes of the world. For sometimes the rage of persecution does not suffer the Church to move in the public sight of all, but compels her to slink as it were into private retreats. *She flees into the wilderness,* Rev. xii. 6. So aforetime, when the Arians ruled, Athanasius and the rest of the orthodox Christians were compelled to retire into corners.

3. It is incumbent upon every head of a family, so to instruct and train his domestics in true Religion, that his house may deservedly obtain the name of *a Church.* The pious Patriarch Abraham did this, of whom God himself testifies, Gen. xviii. 19, *I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, to keep the way of the Lord, and to do justice and judgment.* So Joshua, *As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord,* Josh. xxiv. 15.

4. They are therefore unworthy the name of Christians, who (with respect to Religion) take not any care of their

domestics, but suffer their houses to be so polluted by rioting and drunkenness, that they may more truly be called taverns than Churches.

Vers. 16.

And when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.

He enjoins a threefold command upon the Colossians in this verse: One concerning this Epistle being published in the Church of the Colossians: *When this Epistle is read among you:* The other about transmitting the same to their neighbours the Laodiceans; *let it be read in the Church of the Laodiceans.* The third concerning the reading of some other Epistle, which he had received from Laodicea; *And that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.*

1. *When this Epistle is read among you.*] As to the first; The Apostle wished this his Epistle to be published and read in a usual assembly of the whole Church, that all might know it. Hence we derive two Corollaries:

1. That the Sacred Scriptures were not written for the end that they should be the peculiar property of a few of the clergy; but that they should be open to the whole Christian people, and should be known of all. Hence that the ordinary reading of the Scriptures obtained in the primitive Church, (1 Thess. v. 27,) and that in a language understood by the people, is clear from Justin Martyr, in Apolog. 2; from Tertullian, in Apologet.; and from other Fathers. Which custom B. Rhenanus, in Annotat. ad Tertull. De Corona militis, wished to be restored to the Papal church.*

2. That they err who deny that the reading of the

* Vide p. 134 of this Vol. and Note.

Scriptures itself conduces to the edification of a Christian people in faith and charity, unless there be added at the same time an illustration and exposition of them by a preacher. Far be it from us to detract from the utility or necessity of preaching; nevertheless, we assert with the Psalmist, concerning the word of God read studiously and devoutly, *The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple,* Psal. xix. 7.

2. *Cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans.*] This is the second command of the Apostle, in which the Colossians are ordered to communicate this Epistle to the Laodiceans.

A twofold reason may be offered for this command: One; because the doctrine of this Epistle is general, and on that account was not to be reserved for the private use of one Church, but to be communicated to the whole Church of God; but first to the neighbours of the Colossians, who having read the autograph, could take copies of it, and diffuse them through the whole Church of God.

The other reason is; Because (as it is very likely) this Church on account of its vicinity, was opposed in the same manner as the Church of Colosse, by those Jewish and philosophical seducers: therefore, lest there should be a necessity for a new Epistle, the Apostle would have this made common to both.

Hence observe, That among all the Churches of God, but especially among neighbouring ones, there ought to be a communication of spiritual benefits; so that if one Church should have any thing that might contribute to the edification of another, it should not grudge to impart it.

3. *And that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.*] We have in these words the last particular of the Apostolic command; which enjoins that a certain Epistle sent from Laodicea should be read in the Church of the Colossians. It is probable that the Laodiceans had written to Paul concerning the state of their affairs, and that the Epistle contained something in it which was very useful to be known by the Colossians: Hence the Apostle ordered it to be read by them.

But concerning this Epistle, Commentators have entertained very different opinions. Theophylact would have the first Epistle to Timothy to be understood, which is reported to have been written from Laodicea. Marcion the heretic thinks the Epistle to the Ephesians to be indicated; the title of which he dared impudently enough to interpolate, and to write upon it *to the Laodiceans.* Vide Tertull. advers. Marcion, lib. 5.

Some of the advocates for the Papacy (among whom is Stapleton*) think that some Epistle was written by the Apostle to the Laodiceans, which yet the Church by its authority would not admit into the canon: and by this argument he attempts to prove that the canonical authority

* Stapleton, *Thomas*, was born at Henfield, in Sussex, in 1535, and educated at Canterbury and Winchester Schools, and New College, Oxford. In Mary's reign he obtained a Prebend of Chichester, but on Elizabeth's accession he retired with his parents to Louvain, whither, after an excursion to France and Italy, he returned, and made great progress in his studies. In 1569, Allen invited him to Douay, to found there his English seminary of idolatry and rebellion. He prosecuted this work so acceptably that he was elected their Professor of Divinity, took his degree of Doctor, and was made afterwards Canon of the Collegiate Church of St. Amatus. He had a great affection for the Order of Jesuits, and became a novice in it. But he subsequently forsook them, and accepted an invitation to his old station, Louvain, and the Professorship there, and obtained the lucrative dignity of Dean of Hilverbeck. He became eminent as a Controversialist on the side of the Romish Church, in favour of which he was an indefatigable writer; and at his death in 1598, he left a number of pieces, which, together with his preceding works, were published collectively, at a great expence, by the booksellers of Paris, in four thick vols. folio: 1620, the contents of which are particularized by Dodd. This mass of learning has been denominated Corpus Contoversiarum. The renowned Cardinal Bellarmin is said to have been indebted to him for what he published concerning the Church, Tradition, and Scripture. Clement the VIIIth was so much delighted with the productions of this zealous advocate, that he ordered them to be read daily in times of his refection, and invited him to Rome with a design to confer on him the place of Protonotary, and, as some say, to make him Cardinal. All that is imporportant, however, in his "vast stores," has been well and ably refuted by the justly celebrated Dr. Whitaker and others, (vide Note p. 135 of the present vol.); and from the specimen here given by our Expositor, it may be seen how easily the cobweb sophistry of the most renowned and best educated champions of Popery is swept away, and all its pretty mechanism reduced to a *modicum* of dirt. He who would have more of this writer may consult Dodd's Church History, &c. Vol. ii. pp. 84, et seq.

of the Scriptures rested upon the judgment of the Church; which thus could exclude the writings of the Apostles themselves from the number of the sacred books. The ambiguity of the Latin version, which gives the passage thus, *Eam quæ Laodicensium est vos legatis, and that ye read that which is of the Laodiceans;* and the bold dishonesty of a certain impostor, who put forth a certain forged epistle under the title of *Paul to the Laodiceans*, have given occasion to this error. But I answer, that no one ever accounted that epistle for a genuine Epistle of Paul, except Stapleton, and those like him, who are used to scrape together from every quarter arguments to set the authority of the Church above the Scriptures. Œcumenius in this place observes, He has not said *that* TO *the Laodiceans, but that* FROM *Laodicea*, which Theodoret also had observed before him. As to that which Stapleton (relying upon this passage) desires to hold for a genuine Epistle of Paul; I wonder at the impudent stupidity of the man, since that has already been rejected by all the Fathers who have mentioned it. Theodoret in this place, calls it a *fiction* and *forgery*. Jerome in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, where he reckons up all Paul's Epistles, at length subjoins these words, *Some read and to the Laodiceans; but it is exploded by all.* Lastly, the 2d Nicene Council, Act 6. says, *Among the Epistles of the divine Apostle a certain one is spoken of to the Laodiceans, which our Fathers have reprobated as another man's.* That opinion, therefore, is consonant both to the Greek context and to truth, which we have propounded from the beginning; that an epistle from the Laodiceans to Paul was here meant, not one on the contrary part. And the opinion of Stapleton is to be detested, who determines that it was an Epistle of Paul himself, which all the Fathers have rejected as a forgery and unworthy of attention: Nor is the conclusion more sound, which he would deduce therefrom; namely, that the Church had authority to exclude from the canon a true and genuine Epistle of the Apostle Paul. Thus much of the threefold command of the Apostle.

In those two verses which remain, he bids them to admonish Archippus to fulfil his ministry; and, introducing

a mention of his bonds, he subscribes his salutation with his own hand.

Vers. 17.

And say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.

The Apostle adds a new command about admonishing Archippus, to shew himself watchful and diligent in the discharge of his ministry.

Say to Archippus.] Some think this Archippus was only a deacon in the Church of Colosse; conjecturing it perhaps from hence, that in this place he is ordered *to fulfil the ministry,* την διακονιαν, *which he had received.* But this is weak: For the words διακονος and διακονια are oftentimes taken for any service in the Gospel, so that the office of the Apostleship itself is called διακονια; *I magnify mine office* την διακονιαν, Rom. xi. 13. *Thou shalt be a good minister,* Καλος διακονος, *of Jesus Christ,* 1 Tim. iv. 6. *Whereof I was made a minister,* διακονος, Ephes. iii. 7. That, therefore, is more true which Jerome writes in Epist. ad Philem. namely, that this Archippus was either *a bishop* or at least *a teacher* in the Church of Colosse. But now in the absence of Epaphras (who was his colleague in this evangelical office) he must labour the more diligently therein, that he might supply the place of both. But he (it is very likely) on the contrary began to grow languid in his duty, and therefore needed admonishing. Hence the Apostle wrote, *Say to Archippus, Take heed to the ministry,* &c. Hence we may observe,

1. That even good ministers sometimes grow indifferent to their duty, and need a spur.

2. If private admonition does not suffice, they must be rebuked, by the whole Church, or by some public person in the name of the whole Church.

Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.] The Apostle would have Archip-

pus to be admonished carefully to weigh the following three things.

1. What he had received; *the ministry*] i. e. The Gospel ministry, than which nothing is more sublime, nothing more useful; and therefore there is nothing to be handled more faithfully and diligently. So the whole company of the Apostles judged, Acts vi. 4, *We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word.*

2. From whom he had received this ministry; *In the Lord*] i. e. *by the Lord,* as the Greek Scholia expound it. Therefore by the authority of Christ, who called him to this office, he would have this Archippus to be excited to discharge it diligently and faithfully. For if Christ himself laid this office upon ministers, doubtless he will both look for and require an account of the administration of the office from them. *Woe is unto me,* says the Apostle, 1 Cor. ix. 16, 17, *if I preach not the Gospel! For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward; but if against my will, a dispensation of the Gospel is entrusted to me.*

3. For what end he had received this ministry; *That he might fulfil it.*] This, therefore, ought always to be the care of ministers, not so much to obtain honour, as to execute the labour of the ministry; not so much that he might be dignified with that honourable office, as that he might fulfil its duties. So Paul also admonished his son Timothy, 2 Tim. iv. 5, *Do the work of an Evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.* But what is it *to fulfil the ministry?* It is to do all those things which devolve upon a minister, and which conduce to the salvation of men and the furtherance of the kingdom of Christ. Of this kind are all those things which are enumerated by the Apostle in the same Chapter [to Timothy], *Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort,* and the like. These are the things about which Archippus was to be admonished.

Hence observe, It is necessary for the minister who desires rightly to discharge his duty, often and seriously to consider, what ministry he has received, by whom it was imposed and committed to him, and lastly, what end Christ had in entrusting him with it.

Vers. 18.

The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds. Grace be with you. Amen.

In this last verse of this Epistle, the Apostle does three things. 1. He shews that he himself had written his usual salutation with his own hand. 2. He introduces a mention of his bonds, which he inserts by way of parenthesis. 3. He adds the salutation of his own hand, which he had just mentioned.

The salutation by the hand of me Paul.] That is, In order that you may understand that this Epistle, although written by my amanuensis, is yet genuine, and dictated by me, I affix at the end my usual salutation written with my own hand, which you very well know. This was done prudently by the Apostle in his Epistles, lest any one at any time should obtrude a forged Epistle upon the Church in his name; which he himself intimated 2 Thess. iii. 17, where he says, that this salutation written with his own hand, is *the token in every Epistle,* namely, a sign whereby fictitious epistles could be known from true and genuine ones. The Greek Scholia do not seem rightly to have explained what Paul intended by this *salutation, which is the token in every Epistle.* For they say that he subscribed with his own hand, τὸ, Ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς. Ἢ τὸ, Ἔρρωσθε. Ἢ τι τοιοῦτον; *I salute you; Farewell; or such like.* But it is manifest, the Apostle calls a salutation, that prayer for grace which he subjoins in the same place; *So I write,* says he, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,* &c. And thus also in this place by *salutation* he understands that last word, *Grace be with you,* as Theodoret, Chrysostom, and Ambrose have rightly noted.

But before he subscribed that salutation, by a parenthesis as it were, on a sudden he introduces a mention of his bonds: *Remember,* says he, *my bonds.*] This perhaps

he deferred to the end of the Epistle, with the idea that thereby he should fix it deeper in their minds. And he would have them to bear in mind his bonds on four accounts;

1. That from hence they might derive an example of patience and Christian fortitude, if the like thing should happen to vex and afflict them for the profession of the Gospel. For who would refuse to suffer for the Gospel, when he called to mind, that this celebrated Apostle for the profession of it, had passed great part of his life in bonds?

2. That they might hence take occasion to pray for such a man oppressed with such miseries and griefs. For nothing is more bitter to the afflicted, than for them to suspect that all men cast off all concern for them; nothing on the other hand is more desirable, than that they should understand that other persons have at least a remembrance of their afflictions, and desire from their hearts their deliverance.

3. That they might hence conjecture, how the Gospel should be esteemed; on account of which the Apostle neither refused to undergo ignominy, nor imprisonment, nor death itself. Doubtless it was a great treasure, to retain which all other things were renounced with a ready and willing mind.

4. That from hence a care should be revived within them of comforting and assisting the Apostle by all those duties of Christian Charity which we are bound by the command of Christ to exhibit towards our afflicted brethren. And these are the reasons on account of which we ought always to remember those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. Now let us come to the salutation.

Grace be with you.] This is that salutation always subscribed with the Apostle's own hand to his Epistles, as it respects the sense, although not always in the same words. Neither is it wonderful if this most brave setter-forth of Divine grace, wished this prayer for saving grace to be the mark of his Epistles, whence they might distinguish the genuine from spurious ones. For that he might shew the

sum of our salvation to depend upon the grace of God alone, he was wont to begin his Epistles with this same prayer, as well as to conclude them by it, *as if fortifying the faithful on every side by the wall of Divine grace,* as says Chrysostom. Now by *grace* he understands the paternal favour of God accepting us in Christ the Mediator, and all spiritual blessings which are used to flow to us from this favour of God. Therefore, in this single word *grace* is contained that great fund of blessings which are promised to believers and exhibited in the Gospel.

That last word *Amen,* is derived, as is known, from the Hebrew word AMAN, which in Hiphil signifies *to believe;* in Niphal signifies *to be firm, stable, faithful.* It is therefore a particle of confirmation and certification ; and *when it is attached to a prayer, it is as it were its seal,* as Jerome observes. By this word, then, the Apostle shews the certain persuasion of his heart, that God would hear this his prayer, and bestow his grace abundantly upon them. Thus it behoves us to repose a sure faith in God, as often as we seek any thing from him, especially when we desire to obtain the gifts of saving grace; which, by seeking faithfully from God the Father for his Son's sake, shall be bestowed upon us by the Holy Spirit copiously and freely.

FINIS.

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

DEATH OF CHRIST,

&c. &c.

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

DEATH OF CHRIST,

AS TO ITS EXTENT AND SPECIAL BENEFITS:

CONTAINING A SHORT

HISTORY OF PELAGIANISM,

AND SHEWING THE AGREEMENT OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

ON GENERAL REDEMPTION, ELECTION, AND PREDESTINATION,

WITH THE

PRIMITIVE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

AND ABOVE ALL, WITH THE

HOLY SCRIPTURES.

BY THE

RIGHT REVEREND JOHN DAVENANT, D.D.

DEPUTY TO THE SYNOD OF DORT. &c. &c.

And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.

John vi. 39, 40.

Ipse est (*ut ait Apostolus*) salvator omnium hominum, maximè fidelium. *Quæ Sententia si tranquillo consideretur intuitu, totam Controversiam dirimit.*

Prosper De Vocat. Gentium, lib. 2, cap. 31.

MDCCCXXXII.

TO THE

KIND READER.*

It is not of much consequence to know whether the Author delivered this Dissertation to his auditors in the Public School, before he was sent to the Synod of Dort by His Majesty the King of Great Britain, or immediately after his return; whichever it might be, the work certainly shews that he was a man of great genius, and most acute judgment, a Doctor who was truly an ornament to the School and the Professor's Chair, which indeed he left vacant to the great loss and grief of the University, when he was promoted to the Bishopric of the Church of Salisbury.

It is to be attributed to the iniquity of the times, that this Dissertation did not come to light sooner, for then under the pretext of restraining the itching desire of some, who it was exclaimed exposed nothing else scarcely to the people, but the most profound decrees of God, and especially of Reprobation, to the great prejudice of piety, some persons obtained from the King a prohibition, that no

* This Address is taken from an Edition of the Dissertatio de Morte Christi published in 12mo. in 1683, and is the substance of a much longer one (as far as applicable to this piece) prefacing the Edition published in folio in 1650, together with the Dissertatio de Predestinatione et Reprobatione. Vide Life, &c. Vol. I. p. xlviii.

one should publish any thing in writing or preaching on the questions controverted between the Calvinists and the Remonstrants.

These knotty and thorny questions, Whether the death of Christ is a universal remedy, that is, applicable to all, or whether it is a particular remedy, destined for the elect alone; whether there is an election of some persons to glory, and on the contrary, a preterition of others; whether election is from the mere good pleasure of God, or only from merits foreseen and conditionally: these knotty points, I say, no one hath explained better than this Author. Therefore, take and read him, and I am much deceived indeed, if you will not confess that he has satisfied you. Why should I say more? To give you a foretaste, you have here, in

Chap. 1: An historical and not unacceptable narrative of the rise and origin of the question which is to be discussed concerning the death of Christ, and its intended latitude or extent. Then, in

Chap. 2: A Thesis concerning the death of Christ as a universal cause of salvation applicable to all men is confirmed by arguments. In

Chap. 3: It is vindicated from the objections of adversaries. In

Chap. 4: You will find a most lucid explanation of the distinction, for all men sufficiently, for the elect alone effectually, &c.

I omit the other Chapters, which you will understand better by reading the work itself.

Another Tract is added, which was written on occasion of a Controversy which arose among the Reformed Divines of France, *On the gracious and saving will of God towards sinful men.* The opinion

of the Divines of England was desired on that question, because it seemed likely to contribute not a little towards establishing peace. In the Appendix, therefore, is the opinion of Dr. Davenant on that Gallican Controversy, which having been written with his own hand, and presented by his Nephew to the Most Rev. Archbishop of Armagh, we have taken care to place at the end of the book. Enjoy them, Candid Reader, and farewell.

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

DEATH OF CHRIST.

CHAP. I.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY.

IT is truly a matter of grief and exceedingly to be deplored, that either from the misfortune or the disorder of our age, it almost always happens, that those mysteries of our religion, which were promulgated for the peace and comfort of mankind, should be turned into materials for nothing but contention and dispute. Who could ever have thought that the death of Christ, which was destined to secure peace and destroy enmity, as the Apostle speaks, Ephes. ii. 14, 17, and Coloss. i. 20, 21, could have been so fruitful in the production of strife? But this seems to arise from the innate curiosity of men, who are more anxious to scrutinize the secret councils of God, than to embrace the benefits openly offered to them. Hence it comes to pass that from too much altercation on the points, *For whom did Christ die, and for whom did He not die?* little is thought by mankind individually of applying to ourselves the death of Christ, by a true and lively faith, for the salvation of our own souls. It is my intention in treating of this subject to endeavour rather to appease strife than to excite it anew. Since, therefore, it is conceded by those who extend the death of Christ to all mankind generally, that as to its beneficial reception it is applied only to certain persons in particular; and since on the other hand, those who

restrain it to the elect alone, confess notwithstanding that its benefits extend to all that are called, yea, to all men if they would believe; both sides seem to acknowledge a twofold consideration of the death of Christ. For by both of them it is regarded as an universal cause of salvation applicable to all mankind individually if they should believe, and as a special cause of salvation applied effectually to certain persons in particular who have believed. If I should treat of the death of Christ under this twofold view, it will perhaps appear that in some things which are contested with eagerness, there are rather various modes of speaking than different opinions. I shall commence therefore with certain short and perspicuous propositions, first, those which are brought forward concerning the death of Christ as an universal cause of salvation applicable to all mankind; and then I shall add other propositions on the death of Christ as a special cause of salvation applied efficaciously to certain persons, or at least infallibly to be applied in God's own time. Nor do I intend to enter into any contest, but to give a plain and calm exposition of the whole subject; not intending to engage with any disputant; unless he should oppose us in such a manner that we could not otherwise open the way to the discovery of the truth, than by contending with him. But before I bring forward the above-mentioned propositions, I shall premise some things concerning the origin of this controversy, and the sentiments of the Fathers respecting it, and other similar matters, which may seem necessary to the thorough understanding of the history of this controversy. For as in order to the cure of diseases it is of primary importance to be well acquainted with their origin and causes; so likewise in order to settle controversies, it is an essential advantage thoroughly to understand on what occasion they arose, by whom they were contested, in what manner and how far they were agitated by the antients. Let us therefore apply ourselves to a concise elucidation of this business.

I think then it may be truly affirmed, that before the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius, there was no

question concerning the death of Christ, whether it was to be extended to all mankind, or to be confined only to the elect. For the Fathers, when speaking of the death of Christ, describe it to us as undertaken and endured for the redemption of the human race; and not a word (that I know of) occurs among them of the exclusion of any persons by the decree of God; they agree that it is actually beneficial to those only who believe, yet they every where confess that Christ died in behalf of all mankind. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus (Pedag. cap. 11) says, *That Christ freely brings and bestows salvation to the whole human race.* And of the same opinion is Origen, lib. 5, contra Celsum, *Jesus is declared to have come into the world for the sake of all who ever were sinners, that they might leave their sins, and give themselves up to God.* With whom agrees Primasius* on 1 Tim. ii. on the words *Who gave himself a ransom for all:* he says, *For all men indeed, the blood of Christ has been shed, but it is beneficial only to those that believe.* From which disciple of Augustine, we may conjecture what was the doctrine of Augustine himself. Their adversaries were nevertheless accustomed to object to

* Primasius, a Catholic Bishop of the 6th Century, a native of Africa, who obtained the See of Adrumetum, also known by the name of Justinianopolis, in the Province of Byzacene. About the year 550, he was one of a deputation which was sent to Constantinople on the affairs of the African Churches, and he was at that city in 553, when the fifth General Council assembled there by order of the Emperor Justinian. He refused, however, to take any share in the deliberations of that assembly, though repeatedly invited; and he subscribed to the Constitution which Pope Vigilius issued in defence of the Three Chapters, i. e. the three pieces in the writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, on the subject of the human and divine natures in Christ. Primasius was looked upon as a Commentator on Scripture and a writer of some note in that age; and his Commentary upon the Epistles of Paul, as also a book of his concerning Heresies, are yet extant; but the former Mosheim regards as nothing more than a compilation from the works of Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. Mosheim's view of the writers of this period is worthy of the perusal of any one who desires to be informed in what sense the Church should be regarded as the infallible judge of Scripture. He would also do well to peruse Bower's Life of Pope Vigilius, and the account given under it of the occurrences and men of this period, in order to judge of the claims of the Papal Church to Apostolical Succession and Unity.

Augustine, and others who embraced his doctrine of predestination, that they taught that Christ was crucified for the predestinate alone, and from this objection of the Pelagians some in succeeding ages seized a handle for kindling the afore-mentioned controversy. This is manifest from the objections of the Vincentians,* in which this takes the lead, *That our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for*

* Ex objectionibus Vincentianis, the followers of Vincentius Lirinensis, or St. Vincent of Lerins. He was by birth a Gaul, and a cotemporary with Augustine, entering the Monastery in the Island of Lerins from the storms of a military life, about the middle of the fifth Century; and, from the place of his retirement and great sanctity, becoming known as above described. In his retreat he composed a treatise entitled Commonitorium adversus Hæreticos, in which he undertook to shew the folly of all novel opinions. His production obtained celebrity, and was often reprinted in the 16th and 17th Centuries. An English Translation of it by the Rev. William Reeves, was published in 1709, together with translations of the early Christian Apologists, in 2 vols. 8vo.; the whole is preceded by an able "Dissertation" of above 100 pages, in correction of Daille's work, "upon the right use of the Fathers." It has been supposed that *Vincentius himself* was opposed to Augustine, and put forth 16 propositions as erroneous, which he charged upon Augustine and his scholars: but there is no evidence of this. The work here mentioned seems to have been the only production of his pen; and the object of it is to shew, that men should prove the orthodoxy of their faith, first, by the authority of Holy Scripture, and secondly, by the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Reeves's translation of Vincentius's treatise appears to have been undertaken primarily to prove, that Vincentius was no Pelagian, and that his work was not directed against Augustine's views as had been asserted; and secondarily, that it made nothing for the Roman Catholics, who boasted of his being a Champion for their favourite buttress of Tradition: And it is manifest the work was directed against the heresies of Photinus, Apollinaris, Pelagius, Nestorius, the Manichæans, and such like: that he has collected the Rules which the most orthodox Fathers had laid down as derived from Scripture, to judge of such novelties as these heresiarchs broached, and even citing some of St. Augustine's rules, triumphantly supporting the whole by Scriptural examples and testimonies—by patriarchal and apostolic authority. As to Vincentius's upholding the authority of the Romish Church, or sustaining the popish dogma of Tradition, his Translator has justly observed in his "Preliminary Discourse" to the treatise, "had Vincentius been assisted with a prophetic vision of the future cor-"ruptions in the Church of Rome, he could not have expressed himself "more clearly against it. The whole design and bent of his book is di-"rectly against all innovations in the *Faith*, and for cleaving inviolably to "the *Creed* as *then* explained, and *always* understood by the Apostolic "Churches."—It is indeed a wise and judicious production, and highly de-

the salvation and redemption of all men. It is manifest from the Answers of Prosper to the Capitula of the Gallican Divines;* where their ninth objection is given after this manner: *That the Saviour was not crucified for the redemption of the whole world.* The Semipelagians objected to this as new, invidious, and erroneous. But Prosper meets these objections, not by maintaining that Christ suffered only for the elect, but by shewing whence it arises that the passion of Christ is profitable and saving to the elect alone; namely, because these only through the benefit of special grace obtain persevering faith, whereby they are enabled to apply to themselves the death of Christ. All others without the assistance of this special grace, through their own fault, either remain altogether in unbelief, or draw back from faith received, and therefore fail of the benefits of redemption. This is the tendency of the points in the Answer to the afore-mentioned objection of Vincentius,† *That as far as relates to the magnitude and virtue*

serving the attention of the serious student in the present day. The closing remarks of the preceding Note may be well applied here, and this treatise recommended to every reader who would be guarded against the tares of novelty and heresy, which the enemy of souls is causing to spring and grow again in this age. It is incumbent upon every one to revise the history of the true Church and of real Religion, and to examine the writings themselves of fathers and divines which are now often appealed to, that by the aid of information and experience obtained from them, and by discovering the falsification or perversion of the same, each one, under the signs and amid the perplexity of conflicting opinions in our times, and the prospects which seem to threaten us, may know what to do. 1 Chron. xii. 32.

* Capitula Gallorum, or Objections of the Gallican Divines. These were chiefly the priests of Marseilles, about whose series of objections (which probably were those attributed to Vincentius) Prosper wrote to Augustine, propounding those objections, and praying him to answer them. This letter is among Augustine's Epistles, and his reply to it in his Books of the Saints' Predestination and of the Gift of Perseverance, proved so satisfactory to Prosper's mind, that he became the zealous defender of Augustine against those who attacked his opinions.

† The objections started by others must certainly be here intended; perhaps those Monks who stole a portion of the Manuscript of Vincentius's treatise, and under cover of the signature he had adopted, Peregrinus, perverting his views and carrying them to a point he never intended—like the

of the price, and to the one cause of the human race, the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world: but those who pass through this life without the faith of Christ, and the sacrament of regeneration, do not partake of the redemption. A little afterwards, *The cup of immortality, which is composed of our infirmity, and Divine goodness, has indeed in itself what is profitable for all, but if it be not drunk, it does not heal.* Not dissimilar are the remarks brought forward in answer to the ninth objection of the Gallican Divines. For there it is confessed, although *Christ may be said to have been crucified for those only whom his death profited,* that is, for the regenerate, and those that believe to the end, *it may also be said, that the Redeemer of the world gave his own blood for the world, and the world would not be redeemed.* Lastly, it clearly proves that Augustine did not teach that Christ died for the predestinate alone, because Prosper from his opinion extends the peculiar benefit of His passion, namely, the remission of original sin, to infants even not predestinated. (Resp. ad obj. 2 Gall. & Sentent. 2.) *He who says, that the grace of baptism being received does not take away original sin from those who are not predestinated to life, is not a Catholic.* Which opinion was embraced by the Synod of Valence* even some ages after

Papists of more modern times—broached their quibbles against Augustine, or rather their distortions of his sentiments. Vide Reeves's Translation and Notes, and Cave's Historia Literaria.

* This Synod, or Council, as it is termed by Du Pin, was held in the year 855, by the management of Remi, Bishop of Lyons, in order to confirm his opinions about Grace. It was composed of 14 Bishops of the Provinces of Lyons, Arles, and Vienne, in which the three Metropolitans presided, and Ebbo, Bishop of Grenoble, was present. They made 6 Canons in this Synod concerning Grace, Free-will, and Predestination. They rejected four Canons made at the preceding Council of Quiercy, held under Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, on the doctrine of Predestination, as idle, vain, and false; and condemned a Treatise of Scotus on the same subject, as a silly book. Hincmar afterwards wrote a treatise of thirty-eight Chapters, which he dedicated to Charles the Bald, to defend his four Articles, and confute the Canons of the Council of Valence. In this treatise he sets out with a view of the origin of the heresy about Predestination, and to prove that it commenced after the time of Augustine. Thus much for the boasted Unity of the Church of Rome at this period.

Augustine, as it appears by the fifth canon. From these things it is evident, that although the seeds of this controversy were sown, yet that Augustine and his disciples would never be the patrons of the doctrine, *That Christ suffered for the predestinated alone.* But dismissing Augustine let us come to Pelagius and his followers. And here it is worth while to observe, that in the late discussions of this controversy, two errors contrary to each other have been attributed to Pelagius, but falsely. For those who contend that Christ died for the elect alone, say that the opposite opinion, namely, *That Christ died for all,* is one of the Pelagian errors. On the contrary, those who are on the opposite side, exclaim, that it is mere Pelagianism to say, *That Christ did not die for all men.* But they do injustice to both sides, to Pelagius and to themselves. With respect to the first, a certain learned man says, that this opinion concerning universal redemption and limited deliverance, was attributed to the Pelagians and Semipelagians; and supported by a certain passage of Augustine against Julian (lib. 3. cap. 3.) where he attacks the Pelagians in this manner, *Go on still, go on; and as you say, In the sacrament of the Saviour infants are baptised, but are not saved; are redeemed, but are not liberated; are washed, but are not absolved; so also say, Blood is shed for them for the remission of sins, but they are not cleansed by the remission of sin. These are marvellous things which you say, they are new things which you say, they are false things which you say,* and so on. But in this place Augustine disputes about infants only; nor does he do this in order to shew that it is to be set down as Pelagianism, That Christ died for those who on account of their own unbelief are not saved, but that He died for those, or redeemed those who were not subject to sin, and therefore had no guilt from which they should be freed. For as it respects infants, Pelagius acknowledged in words that they were redeemed, but taught in reality that they had no need of redemption; as it is evident, since he contended, *That there was nothing depraved in them, nothing held under the power of the devil;* in one word, *nothing which could be redeemed by so great a price.* (August.

Epist. 90.) This, therefore, is what Augustine finds fault with in him, not that he taught, That Christ suffered for all: Which opinion of Pelagianism it can be shown was not condemned in any Council that was formed against the Pelagians, nor in any work of Augustine written against the Semipelagians. He professedly writes against the errors of the Semipelagians in his books, On the Predestination of the Saints, and On the benefit of Perseverance: yet he never attempts to infringe the proposition—*That Christ died for all men.* Whatsoever, therefore, may be concluded respecting the truth of this proposition (which will be seen hereafter) it is certain, that it was never accounted a Pelagian dogma, as some persons, leaning on weak foundations, have confidently affirmed.

But I come to the contrary proposition. For there is one who affirms that this also savours of Pelagianism, and writes that Pelagius taught, *That Christ did not die for all men.* Thus Grevinchovius,* in a Dissertation on the death of Christ, with our countryman Ames,† says (p. 51), *Pelagius taught* (as Faustus of Ries testifies, lib. i. cap. 16) *That Christ did not die for all men. Know therefore and consider, that this error which I have objected to you is common to you and Pelagius.* But I know not whether through design or ignorance he produces the egregious prevarica-

* Grevinchovius, a Dutchman who flourished in the beginning of the 17th Century as a Pastor of Rotterdam, and was eminent among the Remonstrants. Weismanni Hist. Eccl. ed. 1745, Part. Post. p. 1158. He is largely noticed in Brandt's Reformation in the Low Countries, Vol. iii. p. 175.

† Dr. William Ames, born of an antient Norfolk Family in 1576, and educated at Cambridge under the celebrated William Perkins, fled from the persecution of Archbishop Bancroft, and was invited by the States of Friesland to the Divinity Chair in the University of Francker, which he filled with great reputation during the space of twelve years, after which he removed to Rotterdam, at the invitation of an English Church there, and became their pastor. He was at the Synod of Dort, and informed King James's Ambassador at the Hague, from time to time, of the debates of that assembly. Besides his controversial writings against the Arminians, he published the following:—Medulla Theologiæ;—Manuductio Logica;—Cases of Conscience;—Analysis on the Book of Psalms;—Notes on the first and second Epistles of St. Peter, &c.—*Maclaine in Mosheim.*

tor Faustus of Ries* as a witness against Pelagius, who, under the pretence of opposing Pelagius, strenuously maintained his cause, and every where attacked the Catholic Doctors, concealing their names. But however serviceable a witness Faustus of Ries might be in this business, Grevinchovius committed a gross error when he thought that the above-mentioned opinion was to be attributed to Pelagius. If he had ever looked into the books of Faustus, he might easily have perceived that in that place he was not writing against the Pelagians, but against those who attribute all to Divine grace and mercy, that is, against Augustine, Prosper, and the rest of the orthodox, whom he babbles against, *as unlike the race of sectaries, but like to the Pelagians in impiety.* (Faustus, lib. i. cap. 3 and 6.) If, therefore, Grevinchovius desires to prove from this passage that this opinion was heretical, he ought to exhibit it as a mark of Augustinian, not of Pelagian heresy. But in reality Faustus did the same as was before shewn, from the objections of the Vincentians, and the Capitula of the Gallican divines, other Semipelagians had done: That is, he calumniously imputed this opinion to Augustine and the orthodox, as necessarily connected with the doctrine of predestination; which nevertheless they never would acknowledge. But to return to Pelagius and the Semipelagians, who it is certain erred in some things about the death of Christ, although neither of the afore-mentioned opinions was reckoned among the antients the error of Pelagius. Pelagius himself erred, in the first place, not directly by extending the death of Christ beyond its proper limits, but indirectly and by consequence, by main-

* FAUSTUS, a learned prelate, was a native of Britain, first became a Monk of the Monastery of Levins, then Abbot of the same, and in 455 was chosen Bishop of Riez, or Ries, in Provence. He wrote against the doctrines of election and reprobation, which pieces have been abridged by Du Pin. His character is drawn by Milner as opposite to the view here given of it, as Milner's representation of Pope Gregory the Great is to the views and testimonies of other historians and writers. Faustus was banished from his See in 481, and died soon after. Vide Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. i. p. 453. A.D. 472; and Du Pin, Eccl. Hist. Cent. 5. vol. iv.

taining that all infants, whether elect or not elect, were free from original sin, whom nevertheless he affirmed were redeemed by the death of Christ. He extended, therefore, redemption by the death of Christ even to those whom he thought to be free from sin, as we said before: that is, he declared that those were redeemed by the death of Christ, who had no sins from which they could be redeemed. This is the senseless doctrine which Augustine continually explodes, namely, That through baptism the death of Christ is applied to those who had no sin that could be expiated by the death of Christ. The words of Pelagius himself are, *Who is so impious as to forbid to a little infant of whatever age that redemption which is common to the human race?* (De pec. orig. cap 19.) And the Council of Carthage, in their Epistle to Innocent (which is the ninetieth among those of Augustine) relates that Celestius had already confessed in the Carthaginian Church, *That the redemption even of little children was effected by the baptism of Christ.* (August. Epist. 59.) Now they who in words admitted the redemption of children, held notwithstanding, (Contra duas Epist. Pelag. 4. 2) *That the same infants do not need the grace of the Saviour to deliver them from perdition, because they have not contracted any contagion from Adam which deserves damnation.* They held, *That baptism is necessary for persons of all ages, in order that the baptised person might be adopted as a son of God, not because he derived from his parents any thing which could be expiated in the laver of regeneration;* In one word, *That the grace of the Redeemer has in them what he may adopt, not what he may purify.* (2 Hypognost. 5.) This, then, is the first error attributed to the Pelagians about the death of Christ, not that they affirmed that He suffered for all, as some have thought; nor that they denied that He suffered for all, as others falsely pretend; but because they dared at the same time to hold these two opposite doctrines, *That redemption through the death of Christ pertains to all men of all ages:* and, *That infants are altogether free from sin and damnable guilt, from which they could be redeemed.* So much for the first error of Pelagius.

Secondly, the Pelagians or Semipelagians erred in explaining the universality of the death of Christ, by joining with it an absurd, false, and very obscure condition. For thus Prosper describes their opinion in an epistle to Augustine: *That our Lord Jesus Christ died for the whole human race, and that no one is altogether excepted from redemption by His blood, even if he should pass all his life in a disposition most alienated from it.* Of the same kind is that assumption of which mention is made by the Church of Leyden in their book on the three Epistles (Biblioth. Patrum. vol. 9. part i. p. 1063), *If any persons can be found who should say that the Lord was crucified for the wicked who shall remain in their wickedness, it is wonderful and incredible if they are able to prove this from direct testimonies of the Divine Scriptures.* The orthodox thought that a conditional addition of this kind should deservedly be rejected. For in the first place, it is uncertain what the Pelagians meant by that addition. If they meant that any benefit or advantage could be derived from the death of Christ by those who spent all their life in impiety and unbelief, they openly contradict the Scriptures, which do not promise any benefit from the death of Christ to such, but threaten them with eternal damnation on account of their contempt of the death of Christ. Moreover, if they would intimate that even those who die in their impiety and unbelief, if they had believed, that is, if they had not died in their unbelief, might have been saved by the merit of Christ crucified, through faith, they express their meaning confusedly and obscurely, and what they seem to assert in one part of the declaration, they foolishly deny in another. Lastly, if they mean by the aforesaid assumption, that Christ in offering up himself had considered any persons as finally unbelieving and impenitent, and yet under this consideration had offered up himself to the Father to obtain pardon and life for them, it is evidently false and erroneous. For as a physician does not think of restoring health to a sick man under this formal consideration, Even if he should obstinately contemn and reject the medicine which he had prepared: so neither does the Physician of

souls will that the precious medicine of His blood should profit any under this consideration, However he may finally trample upon and *despise it*. It is therefore to be observed, that in shewing the opinion of the Semipelagians, many things are joined together by Prosper and Hilary, some of which agree with the truth, and others savour of error. What therefore they relate, that the Semipelagians declared that all men sinned in Adam, and that our Lord Jesus Christ died for the whole human race, and some other things, they do not mention as their errors, but to shew how far they agree with the orthodox, and that they may explain the whole series and connexion of the Semipelagian doctrine. Those then greatly err, who think that all the things which are attributed to the Semipelagians by Prosper and Hilary are erroneous and Pelagian. We assert therefore, that Augustine never attempted to impugn that proposition of the Semipelagians, *That Christ died for the whole human race*, but with all his might refuted the addition they had made to it; where he shews, that the property or benefit of redemption, that is, eternal life, belongs to the predestinate alone, because they alone do not pass through life in unbelief, they never die in their impiety.

The third and most grievous error of the Pelagians and Semipelagians about the death of Christ, respects the primary cause of a different event, namely, that this death of Christ infallibly brings eternal life to certain persons, and does not bring it to others. They referred it to the human will as the primary cause of this difference, presuming that God equally willed the salvation of all men in Christ, nor by a special decree of predestination endued some persons with that faith and perseverance through which they should apply to themselves the death of Christ for salvation. On the contrary, Augustine, with the orthodox, contended, that that persevering faith, by means of which the death of Christ brings salvation to individuals, is extended to the elect by a singular gift of mercy, and does not arise from the good use of free-will in the one rather than in the other. Here the controversy directly regards the grace of

predestination and free-will, and obliquely touches upon the death of Christ, inasmuch as the orthodox, assigning a reason why it eventually brings salvation to some persons, always ascend to the Divine predestination, the Pelagians descend to the human will. Prosper, in his epistle to Augustine, thus expresses their opinion in this matter, *As it respects God,* they say, *that eternal life is procured for all; but as to the freedom of the will, that eternal life is apprehended by those who of their own accord should believe in God, and receive the help of grace through the merit of their believing.* A little afterwards, *They fear to ascribe the merits of the saints to the Divine operation, nor do they think that that which is predestinated can admit of increase or diminution.* The Semipelagians are not blamed by Prosper or Augustine because they assert that Christ died for the whole human race, but because having stated this, they infer that there is no special will of God in predestinating, by which he effectually produces that faith in the elect which regards a saving application to themselves individually of that death of Christ which was endured for all, but suspend it on the uncertain hazard of the human will. This is either the sole or the principal error against which Augustine contended in his books On the predestination of the saints, and the benefit of perseverance. This error also Prosper attacked in his poem On the Ungrateful; in which he teaches from the opinion of the Pelagians, that God equally willed the redemption of all mankind by the death of Christ,

> *But each the voice of his free-will obeys,*
> *And of his own accord sends forth his mind*
> *T' embrace the offer'd light.*
>
> Cap. 10, &c.

Yet the same Prosper says, that God by his predestinating and operating will, would that those only should be redeemed to whom he should give those things, by means of which they should be infallibly led to salvation. And, lastly, he shews that this efficacious will of saving some by the death of Christ and not saving others, did not flow

from the discriminating acts of the human will. To this those words (ch. 13) relate.

Do the mind's movements such results produce?
Does not free-will one cause effect in all?
Then would God's will stand firm, or weakly yield
As human choice directs, &c.

Cap. 13.

Prosper, then, does not oppose (what he elsewhere acknowledges) that Christ suffered for all, but, that God had willed that all men were equally redeemed in fact by the merit of the passion of Christ, and had committed the efficacy of redemption to the will of men. For this is that ulcer of Pelagian doctrine which Faustus of Ries, lib. i. cap. 17, endeavours to conceal under the covering of these words: *God as the Remunerator of their good will, redeemed the willing.* And rightly indeed; but if we speak of efficacious redemption, He first made them willing, being the Inspirer of their good will. If the Pelagians had held this, that the death of Christ was beneficial to mankind according to the special decree and operation of the Divine will, the orthodox would never have objected to them as an error that they maintained, *That Christ died for all.* Hitherto (as we have seen) that controversy on the death of Christ was not formed or agitated between the orthodox and the Pelagians which is discussed in the present day. For neither did Augustine ever oppose as erroneous the proposition, *That Christ died for the redemption of the whole human race:* Nor did he ever acknowledge or defend as his own, *That Christ died not for all men, but for the predestinate alone.* Let us now proceed, and from the records of antiquity search into the controversies about the death of Christ which sprung up after the age of Augustine.

After the death of Augustine and Prosper, Lucidus, a Presbyter, seems to have stirred up this question, which had been some time laid asleep. He taught in plain words, *That Christ died not for all mankind.* Against him arose Faustus, Bishop of Ries, the ringleader of the Semipelagians. He writes to him a terrible Epistle filled with ana-

themas. Among other things he pronounces an anathema upon those who teach that Christ had not died for all. At the close of this epistle he commands Lucidus to send it back to him subscribed with his own hand; and threatens, if he should refuse, that he would accuse him before the Synod of Arles, which was then sitting, and had subscribed these letters and anathemas of Faustus. Lucidus being frightened at this thundering epistle, subscribed it, and thus condemned with his own hand the opinion which he had promulgated. A short time afterwards, the Synod of Leyden was assembled, which added some things to the decrees of the former Council, to which also Lucidus yielded his assent. There is extant an epistle of Lucidus to this Synod of Leyden, in which he condemns those who say, *That Christ our Saviour did not endure death for the salvation of all men;* and, according to the new mode of preaching established in this Council, he asserts, *That Christ our Saviour, according to the riches of his goodness, suffered death for all men.* Both of these letters are extant in the Bibliotheca Patrum (p. 3. tom. 5), the names also of the Bishops being subscribed who are thought to have been at these councils. But the things which are boasted of in the name of these councils are not of much moment, since for the most part they rest merely on the veracity of the heretic Faustus. For if you set aside these letters of Faustus, you may in vain seek elsewhere the afore-mentioned decrees of the Council of Arles, as they are no where else to be found. Nor can those new decrees about preaching, of which Lucidus speaks in his epistle, be found among the canons of any Council of Leyden. The veracity of Faustus in these things is further diminished, because he seems to intimate in his Epistle to Leontius,* that those books on grace and free-will, which are so full of poisonous sentiments, were not only written by the direction of this Council of Leyden, but were also approved of by it. And moreover, he pretends that he inserted nothing in this writing besides the opinion of this Synod.

* Leontius, Bishop of Arles, according to Du Pin.

But indeed it is neither true nor credible that so many learned men could be so deceived by Faustus, as to approve of Pelagian doctrine by his vote. I say these things, not because I wish to condemn as errors those things which are thought to be defined in this chapter by Faustus on the death of Christ, under the approbation of those Synods, but lest any one, in a controverted point, should attribute too much to the authority, or rather, to the bare name of Synods, of which we have nothing certain from remains worthy of credit. This also is an argument with me, that those Fathers of Arles and Leyden, could not have sanctioned, under so grievous an anathema, that no one should preach that Christ died only for the elect, because in the commentaries of the Fathers who lived in the subsequent ages, that mode of speaking is often found, or at least is left in doubt. Remigius of Rheims, on the 8th of Romans, at the words, *He who spared not His own Son, but freely delivered him up for us all,* says, *for us all,* that is, *for those who are predestinated to eternal life.* And on 1 Tim. ii. 6, *Who gave himself a ransom for all,* adds in explanation, *Understand, for the elect.* Yet, that there was some difference at least in the mode of speaking among the Doctors of that age, appears from this same Remigius. For on those words which are in Hebrews ii. 9, *That He should taste death for every man,* he writes thus, *Some Doctors understand this absolutely, that it means for all for whom He tasted it, that is, for the elect, who are predestinated to eternal life. But others understand it generally, that He tasted death for all, believing and unbelieving, saying, He died indeed for all, though all will not be saved.* Gregory the Great, in one and the same Homily (Ez. l. 1. Hom. 2.) calls Christ *The Redeemer of mankind, and the Redeemer of all,* and yet afterwards subjoins, *That this Redeemer of all delivered himself to death for the life of the elect.* To these two I will add Haimon, Bishop of Halberstadt, who flourished about the year of Christ 850, and who in his Commentaries so touches upon this controversy, that he determines nothing certain on either side. On the 5th chapter of the latter Epistle to the Corinthians, he says, *Christ came into*

the world, being born without sin, living without sin; though innocent He died for all those who are predestinated to life. And as Prosper says, and John Chrysostom, and other Doctors, although all do not believe, He did his part, dying for all. A little after, on those words, *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,* he says, *Through Christ He reconciled to himself the world, that is, all those who were predestinated.* In the 2d Chapter to the Hebrews also, he mentions both opinions, in the same words as we shewed Remigius had used before. We see, therefore, that these holy Fathers did not much care for that anathema fortified by the authority of Councils, which Faustus brings forward; but notwithstanding retained to themselves the liberty of writing and speaking. Yet I think that it ought to be added, that those Fathers, when they restrict the death of Christ to the predestinate, do not do it absolutely; but in consideration of the saving effect which, by means of faith, it brings to them alone: and on the other hand, when they extend this death of Christ to all, they do not extend to all that special will of God in calling them according to his own purpose, in giving them faith, and effectually working in certain individuals according to his own counsel and operation, that they may reap the benefit of the death of Christ. Therefore they so understand the universality of redemption that they did not subvert the secret counsel of predestination, in which thing they differed widely from the Pelagians and Semipelagians. They also understood redemption in such a restricted sense, that at the same time they acknowledged that it pertained to all men individually under the condition of faith. While Haimon himself (whom we just mentioned) was living, new tragedies were brought forward about this question of the death of Christ. For one Godeschalcus, a Monk, as Flodoardus* has recorded (Hist. Remens. 3. 14), that he

* FLODOARD, or Frodoard, an Ecclesiastical Historian of this period, being first Keeper of the Archives in the Cathedral, and afterwards Abbot of the Monastery at Rheims, in the former part of the 9th Century, and publishing a history of the Church of Rheims from its foundation to 948, and a Chronicle of his times, much esteemed by the learned.

might make himself known to the people by the novelty of his doctrines, selected for himself certain subjects to be publicly discussed; among which (not to speak of those which are not applicable to our present purpose) this was one of the chief: *That our Lord Jesus Christ was not crucified and put to death for the redemption of the whole world, that is, not for the salvation and redemption of all mankind, but only for those who are saved.* Which is the same as if he had said, *only for the predestinated.* This sentiment of Godeschalcus was discussed and condemned first by the Synod of Mentz,* and afterwards by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who assembled another Synod, and committed Godeschalcus himself to confinement in a monastery, that he might not disseminate his errors. They published also some opinions opposite to the sentiments of Godeschalcus, in which what regards our present case is as follows, (Bibl. Pat. vol. 9. p. 1093. Eccl. Lugd.) *Our Lord Jesus Christ, as no man is, was, or will be, whose nature was not assumed by Him, so no man is, was, or will be, for whom He did not suffer, although all are not redeemed by the mystery of his passion.* But this definition of Hincmar of Rheims, and the other Bishops who adhered to it, was disapproved of at Leyden, where Remigius presided. Therefore they undertook an examination of the four opinions of Hincmar which were opposite to those of Godeschalcus; and particularly of that opinion of Godeschalcus, which referred to the death of Christ, of which they speak thus, *We would wish that nothing should be spoken or defined confusedly and inconsiderately on this subject; since it has its own depth and difficulty, which should be diligently searched out from the truth of the Holy Scriptures and the authority of the orthodox Fathers, and not determined by our presumption.* And they so far disapproved of the definition of Hincmar which was opposed to the doctrine of Godeschalcus, that they wrote about it in this manner: (Bibl. Pat. vol. 9. p. 1058. Eccl. Lugd.) *What else can we answer respecting this your definition,*

* This Synod was assembled in the year 848, by Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz. Mosheim's account of the circumstances that followed, as affecting Godeschalcus, is highly interesting.

but that we would earnestly request and admonish those who gave it, that they would endeavour vigilantly and faithfully to examine, lest by consideri g too little what has been said, they should speak such things contrary to the faith and their own consciences, and destroy their own definition by the things before spoken of. Nor did the Church of Leyden think it sufficient to refute in writing some things which were contained in those definitions of Hincmar, but, together with the Bishops of Arles and Vienne in the Synod of Valence, confirmed canons in which some things are restored which they thought blameable in the opinions of Godeschalcus, and some things also which they judged worthy of reproof in those of the adversaries of Godeschalcus. Omitting the rest, we mention only those things which were discussed and confirmed respecting the present controversy against Hincmar, and those who favoured his views. They, as you have heard, determined, *That no man ever had been, was, or would be, for whom Christ did not suffer.* But the Church of Leyden distributed the whole human race, as it were, into certain classes. The first order is of *those who are elected to eternal life;* of whom none can perish, and who are all saved. The second is of *those that believe, who by a right faith receive the grace of baptism, and by it are cleansed from their sins, but afterwards turn away from the faith, and die in their unbelief.* The third is of *those who being as yet in unbelief, are nevertheless by the mercy of God to be called to the faith, and to be cleansed by baptism.* They profess that Jesus Christ came into the world and was crucified for these three classes of mankind, that he might save them. Two other classes of mankind are excluded from the benefit of the death of Christ. One is of *those who from the beginning of the world until the coming of Christ, died in their impiety.* The other is of *those who since the advent and passion of Christ even to the end of the world, shall continue in unbelief.* (Eccl. Lugd. p. 1094 and 1058.) To which plainly agree the decrees of the Council of Valence, in the fourth and fifth canons. But in these different opinions of Hincmar and Remigius two things are to be observed: One is that Remigius and the council of Va-

lence, although they did not approve the sentiment of those who extended the death of Christ to all men individually, yet they have not confined it to the predestinate alone. The other is, That in this difference of opinions, those ancient Fathers cultivated the peace of the church, and did not interrupt it in order to accuse each other of heresy. Which may evidently be collected from the words of the church of Leyden, which after the refutation of the opinions of their adversaries, adds these words (Eccl. Lugd. p. 1063), *We much wish that their opinion, although it proceeds from their piety, yet for peace sake, and the venerated piety of the most blessed Fathers, may not be renewed. Therefore no dispute should be engaged in by one against the other, nor should one sentiment be condemned rather than the other. And because it may truly happen that there is something concealed in this matter, through our ignorance, nothing should be rashly defined, so that in whichever mode of speaking any one may acquiesce, he should not be esteemed a heretic, unless he become such through his contentiousness.* I wish that in this litigious age we had before our eyes this specimen of Christian charity and modesty, by which, as it appears to me, that tempest which was excited by the preaching of Godeschalcus was so happily settled and appeased. For in the following ages I find no contests about the aforesaid controversy. At length theological questions came into the hands of the Schoolmen, who, although they were fruitful artificers of disputes, yet were unwilling to renew this subject. To them it seemed sufficient to teach that Christ died for all *sufficiently*, for the predestinated *effectually;* which, since no one could deny, no handle was given for using the saw of contention. The Doctors of the Reformed Church also from the beginning spoke in such a manner on the death of Christ, that they afforded no occasion of reviving the contest. For they taught, *That it was proposed and offered to all, but apprehended and applied to the obtaining of eternal life only by those that believe.* At the same time, they judged it improper to mingle the hidden mystery of Election and Preterition with this doctrine of the Redemption of the human race through

Christ, in such a manner as to exclude any one, before he should exclude himself by his own unbelief. Let us hear their own words. Philip Melancthon constantly admonishes that we should not unseasonably mix the speculation of predestination with the promises of the Gospel. In his Common-places, On the promises of the Gospel, page 195, he writes thus: *As it is necessary to know that the Gospel is a gratuitous promise, so it is necessary to know that the Gospel is an universal promise, that is, that reconciliation is offered and promised to all mankind. It is necessary to hold that this promise is universal, in opposition to any dangerous imaginations on predestination, lest we should reason that this promise pertains to a few others and to ourselves. But we declare, that the promise of the Gospel is universal. And to this are brought those universal expressions, which are used constantly in the Scriptures, such as,* GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD, THAT HE GAVE HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, THAT WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH IN HIM SHOULD NOT PERISH, BUT HAVE EVERLASTING LIFE. *And the reason why all do not obtain the promises of the Gospel, is because all do not believe it.* Calvin in many places gives his opinion in the same manner. On the same words, John iii. 16, *God so loved the world,* &c. he says, *He hath put an universal mark, both that he might invite all men promiscuously to the participation of life, and that he might leave the unbelieving without excuse. For this is the meaning of the word* WORLD. *For although there is nothing found in the world worthy of the Divine favour, yet he shews himself to be propitious to the whole world; since he calls all without exception to believe in Christ.* A little afterwards: *It appears that Christ is set before all, but God opens the eyes of the elect alone to seek him in faith.* And on Rom. v. 18, *He makes grace common to all, because it is set before all, not because it is actually extended to all. For although Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and through the goodness of God is offered to all indifferently, yet all do not apprehend him.* So likewise Bullinger,* on Rev.

* BULLINGER (Henry), a native of Bremgarten, in the Canton of Zurich, born 1504. When only twelve years old he was sent to school at Emeric, with little more provision than the clothes upon his back, and for

v. Serm. 28, *The Lord died for all: but all are not partakers of this redemption, through their own fault. Otherwise the Lord excludes no one but him who excludes himself by his own unbelief and faithlessness.* Benedict Aretius* has similar expressions on 1 Tim. ii. *Christ,* says he, *died for all, yet notwithstanding all do not embrace the benefit of his death, because by their own wickedness, and the corruption of their nature, they despise the offered grace.* To these I add Musculus,† who in his Common-places speaks thus (On the redemption of the human race, page 151); *The title of this section professes what is for our purpose,* viz. *The redemption of the human race.* After a few words, he adds, *We know that all are not partakers of this redemption; but the perdition of those who are not saved by no means hinders this redemption from being called universal, since it is not destined*

three years supported himself by singing in the streets. He then removed to Cologne, where, applying closely to literature, and becoming acquainted with the works of Melancthon, he adopted the opinions of the Reformers, and having abandoned the Romish church, connected himself closely with Zuingle, accompanying him to Berne, to the disputations held there in 1528. His friend falling in the battle fought between the Catholic and Protestant Cantons, on the 11th of October, 1531, Bullinger succeeded him as pastor of Zurich, where he had taken refuge, and while in this capacity, defended in 1545 the tenets of his brethren against the censures of Luther, resisting at the same time the attempts of Bucer to bring about a compromise between the two sects respecting the eucharist. He also distinguished himself by the effectual resistance which he made against the proposed treaty, by which a number of Swiss mercenaries were to be taken into the service of France, on the ground that it was inconsistent with Christianity for any one to let himself out for the purpose of killing those who had never injured him. He died at Zurich in 1575, leaving behind him ten volumes of printed controversial treatises, with several manuscript pieces. It is a singular proof of the opinions of the early Reformers respecting the celibacy of the Clergy, that at the age of sixty, with eleven children, Bullinger thought it necessary to publish an apology for continuing a widower.—*Bayle. Strype's Annals.*

* Aretius (Benedict) an Ecclesiastic of Berne, in Switzerland, eminent as a botanist and theologian. In the former science he published an account of Alpine plants, which is highly spoken of. In Divinity, on which he gave lectures at Marpurg, his works are—A Commentary on the New Testament, and Examen Theologicum, in folio, which it is said was printed twelve times in three years. He died in 1574.

† Vide page 214 of this Vol. Note ‡.

for one nation, but for the whole world. A little afterwards: *That reprobate and deplorably wicked men do not receive it, is not through any defect in the grace of God, nor is it just that on account of the children of perdition, it should lose the glory and title of universal redemption, since it is prepared for all, and all are called to it.* To all these may be added Zanchius,* who so defends predestination, that at the same time he contends that Christ died for all. For when he had taught that Christ had not died for all, *as it regards the omnipotent will of God, that is, his absolute good pleasure of conferring eternal life on all mankind, through the death of Christ*, yet he subjoins, *That it is not false that Christ died for all men as it regards his conditional will, that is, if they are willing to become partakers of his death through faith. For the death of Christ is set before all in the Gospel, and no one is excluded from it, but he who excludes himself.* (Miscel. de Præd. Sanctor. Explic. Thes. 13.) That I may not be tiresome, I omit the rest. This is one thing I should wish to be observed, That our orthodox Doctors so explained the doctrines of election and reprobation, that the decree concerning the chusing of certain individual persons to the infallible obtaining of eternal life, and passing by others, might not infringe the universality of the redemption accomplished by the death of Christ.

Hitherto we have briefly surveyed those things which relate to the historical knowledge of this controversy. From which it is manifest, not only that the antient Fathers, but also our modern Divines, confessed that the death of Christ pertained in some manner to the whole human race. Yet in our age it has pleased some Divines to pass over these limits, and openly to defend in exclusive terms this proposition, *That Christ died for the elect alone.* To whom on the opposite side others reply, *That Christ offered himself to God the Father to redeem all individuals equally.* That we may throw some light upon this question, we will now enter upon that twofold consideration of the death of Christ of which we have before made mention, and will reduce it to certain propositions.

* Vide Vol. I. page 237, Note.

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

DEATH OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE DEATH OF CHRIST, AS THE UNIVERSAL CAUSE OF SALVATION, APPLICABLE TO ALL MANKIND.

WE enter now on our subject, and in the first place propose to consider the death of Christ as it is generally represented in the holy Scriptures, and ought to be regarded by us, as an *universal* remedy appointed by God, and applicable for salvation to the whole human race. Then we shall proceed to the other point in dispute respecting the death of Christ, and take into consideration how far it may be viewed as a *particular* remedy, by the special decree of God to be efficaciously and infallibly applied to the salvation of particular persons. Should we be able to elucidate these two points, it will have a considerable tendency both to remove the difficulties with which the controversy on the death of Christ is involved, and to assuage the heat of theologians who have been warmly engaged in polemic discussion. In the former of these views with regard to the death of Christ, several propositions will occur to be discussed, of which the first and chief, as the basis of the rest, may be stated in these words:

1. *The death of Christ is represented in holy Scripture as an universal remedy, by the ordinance of God, and the nature of the thing itself, applicable for salvation to all and every*

individual of mankind. This proposition is first to be explained, then to be confirmed by testimonies and arguments, and lastly, to be defended against the objections which are brought against it. With respect to the explanation of the terms, when we speak of *the death of Christ,* we comprehend in it the whole obedience of Christ, active and passive, the completion of which, and as it were the last act, was effected in his death; on which account Divines are accustomed by synecdoche to attribute to his death what relates to his entire obedience. Whatever therefore Christ did, and whatever he suffered, from the cradle to the cross, the whole of the meritorious and satisfactory work of the Redeemer we comprehend in our proposition to be allied to and connected with his death. Thus the Apostle, in Rom. v. 19, makes *the obedience of Christ,* universally considered, the cause of man's salvation, *By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* And in Phillip. ii. 7, 8, when it is said, *That he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,* the Apostle does not exclude from his meritorious work any part of the antecedent obedience of Christ, but rather considers it included, and teaches that this meritorious obedience of Christ began at that time when he took the form of a servant, and was consummated when he offered himself on the cross. Under the word *death,* then, we comprehend that infinite treasure of merits which the Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ, by doing and suffering, procured and laid up for our benefit. Again, when we say that this death or this merit *is represented in the holy Scriptures as the universal cause of salvation,* we mean, That according to the will of God explained in his word, this remedy is proposed indiscriminately to every individual of the human race for salvation, but that it cannot savingly profit any one without a special application. For *an universal cause of salvation,* or *an universal remedy,* includes these two things: first, that of itself it can cure and save all and every individual: secondly, that for the production of this determinate effect in each individual it should require a determinate application. Not

unaptly, therefore, did Aquinas say, *The death of Christ is the universal cause of salvation, as the sin of the first man may be said to be the universal cause of damnation. But it is necessary that an universal cause should be applied particularly to each individual, that its proper effect may be experienced.* Further, what we maintain in our proposition, that this universal cause of salvation is applicable *to all and every individual of mankind,* at once excludes the apostate angels, to whom (whatsoever may be thought of the intrinsic value and sufficiency of this remedy) according to the revealed will of God, its universality is not extended. Nor even with respect to men can it be extended so universally as to be applicable to every one under every *state* and *circumstance.* For it is not applicable to the dead or the damned, but to the living: nor to the living under every condition, but under the conditions ordained by God. The death of Christ was not applicable to Peter for salvation, *if Peter had persisted in denying Christ to the last.* And the same death of Christ was capable of application to Judas, *if Judas had repented and believed in Christ.* For this cause, therefore, we have not merely said that it is applicable to all and every individual of mankind, but on this being added, *from the ordination of God, and the nature of the thing.* For there is in the Gospel a certain ordination of God, according to which the death of Christ is applicable to all and every living man; which cannot be truly affirmed of demons or the damned. To this those words in the conference at the Hague seem to relate, in which the Contra-remonstrants endeavoured to shew some difference between the state of the devils and certain unbelievers. *For the devils,* they say, *a Mediator was not given or ordained, but for men* (page 154). A little after, *Unbelievers, although they have deserved condemnation, yet there is at present some way and means through which they may avoid it, namely, if they should believe* (page 155). *Any sinner may know, even before he departs this life, that Christ died for him also, as far as pertains to the sufficiency of his merits, and also as to their application, provided only he should believe in him* (page 156). Such are their senti-

ments. In which it is taken for granted, that the death of Christ is, according to the mode prescribed by God, applicable to any living person. And should it be objected, that it is not applicable to any person remaining in impenitence and unbelief, let it be remembered that the non-application in such cases arises not from the limitation of the remedy, but because the only mode of application appointed by God is obstinately rejected. For no remedy can be available if its application be obstinately refused and pertinaciously rejected even to the last.

Once more let it be observed, we do not affirm that the death of Christ at the moment of his dissolution, was actually *applied* to all and every individual of mankind, nor that after his oblation it was infallibly *to be applied*, but that, according to the appointment of God, it is *applicable* to all. For God hath ordained that it should be applicable to every individual through faith, but he hath not determined to give that faith to every individual, by which it may be infallibly applied. Why he should give this medium of application to some and not give it to others, ought not to be inquired, since it cannot be solved; but must be referred to the secret will of God. This may suffice for the explanation of our proposition: Let us now proceed to the proof of it.

And here it is to be shewn, not from human reason or fancy, but from the holy Scriptures, that the death of Christ, according to the will of God, is an universal remedy, by the Divine appointment, and the nature of the thing itself, applicable for salvation to all and every individual of mankind. From many testimonies I shall select a few:

1. The principal is that of John iii. 16, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life.* It is not difficult to deduce every particular of the aforementioned proposition from these words. For, in the first place, Christ given up by the Father to death, is here proposed as an universal remedy provided for the whole world. Then this panacea of the death of Christ is de-

clared applicable for salvation to every man, and the manner or condition of the application is at the same time shewn in those words, *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish.* From this testimony we incontrovertibly conclude, that the death of Christ by the ordination of God is applicable to every man, and would be applied if he should believe in Christ. Shew me an individual of the human race to whom the minister of the Gospel may not truly say; *God hath so loved thee, that he gave his only begotten Son, that if thou shouldest believe in him, thou shalt not perish but have everlasting life.* This, on the certainty of his believing, might be announced to any individual. Therefore the death of Christ is applicable to every man according to this will and ordination of God. I know that some learned and pious Divines, by *the world* here understand the world, or whole body of the elect, and rely on this argument, that it is said, *the Son of God was given. that whosoever believeth in him should not perish:* and the elect alone are they who so believe in Christ that they should not perish, but have everlasting life. But I answer, that nothing else can be inferred from hence, than that the death of Christ brings salvation eventually to the elect alone, and is actually applied by means of faith: but it cannot be inferred that it was not a remedy applicable to others, and by the ordination of God to be applied, if they should believe. We will illustrate this by a case in some measure parallel. Suppose that all the inhabitants of a certain city laboured under some epidemic and mortal disease; that the King sent to them an eminent physician furnished with a most efficacious medicine, and caused it to be publicly proclaimed, that all should be cured that were willing to make use of this medicine. Doubtless we might truly say of this king, that he so loved that city, as to send his own most skilful physician to it; that all who were willing to attend to his advice, and take his medicine, should not die, but recover their former health. But if any should object that this physician was sent only to those who should follow *his* prescriptions, and that his medicine was applicable by the appointment of the king

only to those who were willing to take it, he would in reality not only make the beneficence of the king appear less illustrious, but affirm what was evidently false. For medical assistance was offered to all, without any previous condition on the part of the person sent, or of the sick; healing medicine applicable to all without exception was provided. The willingness to receive the physician and take the medicine had no connexion with the intention of the Sovereign in sending the medical assistance, but with the certain restoration of health.

The antient Fathers seem to have been much pleased with this similitude. Prosper has respect to it, when Vincentius objected, *That according to the opinion of Augustine, our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men,* he replies, *For the disease of original sin, by which the nature of all men is corrupted, the death of the Son of God is a remedy.* And a little after, *This cup of immortality has indeed in itself this virtue that it may benefit all men, but if it be not taken it will not heal.* Our faith therefore is required not merely to assent to the proposition, that God has given or ordained his Son to be a remedy for us, but that being given and ordained, He should be *received* by us to the obtaining of eternal life. Rhemi and Haimo enlarge the aforesaid similitude on those words Hebrews ii. *That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.* Whom, if you please, you may consult.

2. The second testimony is derived from two passages conjointly considered and compared. The first is John iii. 17, 18, *God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth in him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.* Let us annex to these words those of John xii. 47, 48, *If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world but to save the world. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.* In these words we learn that the Son of God was sent by the

Father, that he might bring an universal remedy applicable to the whole world. Nor can the sense be restrained to the world of the elect. For, first, *this world,* to save which Christ was *sent* is divided into believers and unbelievers. But the world of the elect consists only of believers, or at least, of those who shall ultimately believe. Secondly, because some will be condemned, to save whom it is here affirmed Christ was sent. But none of the elect shall be damned. Thirdly, because those who are here declared to be condemned, are said to have come under condemnation *because they have not believed in the only begotten Son of God,* or, *because they have rejected him.* In which manner of speaking, it is implied in a way sufficiently perspicuous, that he was offered to them by God, and sent to save them. But how, or in what sense can we rightly understand that Christ was sent to save those who perish by their own fault, that is, through their own unbelief? Not otherwise than is expressed in our proposition; namely, that the death of Christ is an universal cause of salvation appointed by God and applicable to every man on the condition of faith, which condition these by their own voluntary wickedness have despised. Thus did Calvin understand these words; for on John iii. he has observed, *That the word* WORLD *is repeated again and again, that no one might suppose that he should be driven away, if he kept the way of faith.* And on John xii. 47, he has observed, *In order that the minds of all men might be inclined to repentance, salvation is here offered to all men without distinction.* It appears, therefore, from these passages, that the death of Christ is to be proposed and considered as a remedy, applicable to all men for salvation, by the appointment of God, although it may be rejected by the unbelieving.

3. The third testimony we produce from Acts xiii. 38, &c. *Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man* (Jesus Christ) *is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in*

the prophets, Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish. Then, in the 46th verse, *It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo! we turn to the Gentiles.* From which words it is evident, That, by the appointment of God, the death of Christ is proposed and offered to mankind without distinction, as a remedy applicable to each and every man for the obtaining of remission and eternal life. It is plain, also, that according to the will and appointment of God, this remedy was applicable, not only to those to whom it is actually applied through faith, but even to the despisers, who rejected Christ and eternal life by their unbelief. And from the 48th verse it likewise appears, that faith itself, (by means of which the divinely appointed remedy applicable to all, is actually applied to some) is not found in unbelievers through their own fault, and is produced in them that believe through the special favour of a merciful God. And here the mystery of election at length presents itself. But let us not by an unreasonable and too deep speculation into an awful subject, draw a veil over that Divine philanthropy from which has emanated a remedy applicable to all and every individual of sinners, though certainly effectual only to all those who believe.

4. The fourth testimony is contained in 2 Cor. v. 19, 20, *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them: and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.* It is to be observed in the first place, That the Apostle here lays down what he calls reconciliation procured from God through the mediation of Christ, as a common benefit for the whole world. And indeed to *have reconciled the world* generally can mean nothing else than to have ordained and granted to the world that universal remedy or propitiatory sacrifice of the death of Christ, which is applicable to all. Secondly, It is proper to observe, in what sense God is said actually *to have reconciled the world to himself,* by the merit of the

offering of Christ, namely, because the sacrifice of Christ being made, *he will not impute their trespasses unto them;* that is, He will not require from any man that he should make satisfaction for his own sins, that being impossible; nor, further, will he punish any one for his sins who shall make use of this propitiatory sacrifice. And lastly, it is to be remarked, that this reconciliation, this not imputing of sins, of which the Apostle speaks, is considered as performed on the part of God and Christ, as soon as Christ is understood to have laid down his life for the sins of the world. But on the part of sinful men there remains the Ministry of the Gospel, by which it is made known to men; there remains that the Gospel should be believed, before men are brought as it were into the actual possession of this grace. And on this account the Apostle subjoined, after he had said that *God in Christ reconciled the world to himself,* nevertheless it behoved Ministers to discharge their embassy, and exhort all to be reconciled to God. From all which it appears, as we submitted in our proposition, that the death of Christ was ordained by God and preached by the Apostles as a remedy applicable according to the will of God, to all men for reconciliation and salvation; although, in order that men should be actually reconciled, there is need of previous repentance and faith. So Aquinas understood this passage, *Be ye reconciled to God. This,* says he, *seems to be contrary to that which he said, God hath reconciled us to himself; for if he himself hath reconciled, what necessity is there that we should reconcile, for we are already reconciled. To this it is to be said, that God hath reconciled us to himself as the efficient cause, namely, on his own part; but that it may be advantageous to us, it is needful also that reconciliation should be made on our part.* But Musculus has explained this whole passage so clearly, that we should be sorry not to bring forward his words: *God,* says he, *reconciled to himself the whole human race, which was, and is, and will be from the beginning to the end of the world, when he gave his Son to death for all.* Then again, after a few words: *God reconciled the world to himself in Christ, not imputing to them*

their sins, as far as relates to the work of reconciliation itself—prepared and sufficient for reconciling the whole human race. But since reconciliation cannot take place between the unwilling, the Ministry of reconciliation was appointed by God himself, by which all are called and invited heartily to embrace this grace. If the whole world would embrace it, certainly the whole world would be reconciled to God, all imputation of sins being removed, and would be saved, nor would any mortal perish. Lastly, this also is added; *That the ministers of this reconciliation should preach nothing else than the reconciliation made by God, and so made that he might reconcile the world to himself through Christ, not imputing to them their trespasses. To preach this grace faithfully, and to call every one to repentance and faith in Christ, is to preach the word of reconciliation.* Thus far Musculus. Those, therefore, who altogether apply themselves and adhere to the secret of predestination, so as at the same time to fritter away, and evidently to subvert this reconciliation of the world, overturn also the ground of our preaching the Gospel, which consists in this chiefly, that we assure every man, that God is so reconciled to him by the death of Christ, that if he believes in Christ, he will not impute to him his trespasses, but will bestow upon him eternal life. This work, confirmed on the part of God and Christ, is called *the reconciliation and redemption of the world,* although He hath not willed that the unbelieving and impenitent should be reconciled and redeemed. Thus Prosper speaks (ad Capit. Gallor. object. 9.) *The Redeemer of the world gave his own blood for the world, and the world would not be redeemed.* Thus the Church of England speaks in the 31st Article, *The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that alone.* Thus also St. Paul speaks, when he says, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself,* that is, God, by giving his Son to death, himself supplied for his enemies an asylum of reconciliation, to which whosoever flees for refuge, has God so appeased and reconciled

through the benefit of it, that he will at once receive him into his favour.

5. The fifth testimony is derived from the epistle to the Hebrews (chap. ii. 3, and iv. 1, 2, &c.) *How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him,* &c. *Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.* From the whole of this discourse of the Apostle, it appears, in the first place, that in the Gospel, salvation is offered promiscuously to all those to whom it is preached; for on this very account it is called *salvation.* Then it appears, that this salvation which is laid up in Christ, and offered to men in the Gospel, is neglected and repelled by many, namely, by all unbelievers who have not faith in the promises of the Gospel. Lastly, it also appears, that this neglect and unbelief is the true cause which prevents the ungodly from obtaining the rest of the Lord, that is, which deprives them of eternal life offered to them in Christ. But none of these things can be said truly and seriously unless it is presupposed that salvation through the death of Christ is applicable to all men, according to the appointment of God. For who can properly be said to have neglected salvation, that is, the cause of salvation appointed and prepared by God, which never was prepared or appointed for him, or applicable to him? Or how does this neglect and unbelief exclude them from a participation in the salvation offered through Christ, who were entirely excluded from it on account of a defect of the appointment of God? We must therefore admit that there must necessarily be some appointment of God, according to which, Christ, as a cause of salvation, was applicable to them who fell from salvation by their own fault.

The last testimony is deduced from those passages combined, in which the will of Christ in dying is declared to be of such extent as to be the procuring cause of salvation to all. Of this description are, 2 Cor. v. 14, *One died for all.* 1 Tim. ii. 6, *Who gave himself a ransom for all.* Heb. ii. 9, *That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.* And 1 John ii. 2, *He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.* I omit other texts. These and such like passages, although the conclusion of some of the Remonstrants cannot be inferred from them, namely, *That by this death of Christ reconciliation and remission of sins were acquired or obtained for each and every man:* Or, *That each and every man was restored into a state of grace and salvation by the death of Christ itself:* nevertheless they prove in a manner sufficiently strong what we intend, That this death of Christ was appointed and ordained by God and Christ for an universal cause of salvation, or an universal remedy for all men, applicable to the obtaining of reconciliation and remission. I do not therefore see by what right or what necessity some divines limit passages of this kind, in which Christ is plainly affirmed *to have suffered for all*, to the elect alone, or to the whole body of the elect alone, when in the aforesaid sense they may be most truly extended to all other persons. For nothing hinders but that that may be applicable to all by some Divine appointment which, from the predestination of God, is infallibly to be applied only to the elect. For they grant that dogma of the Remonstrants (Colloq. Hagiens. p. 139) *That Christ died not for the elect alone, but also for other men,* if it be understood *only of the sufficiency of the merits of Christ;* but if only of reconciliation effectually or actually produced, they deny it. This is enough for me. For they will never rightly defend the alone-sufficiency of the death of Christ as to all, unless they confess at the same time that it is applicable to all for salvation, according to the appointment of God. Since it is foolishly and falsely asserted, that He died for all sufficiently, who is affirmed to have died only for the elect; because the word *sufficiently* is not

a diminishing term, nor does it take away the truth of the thing affirmed. But more will be said respecting this, when we come to our second proposition. Hitherto we have contended from the testimonies of Scripture. Next we shall from certain arguments very solidly founded (as it appears to us) in the Scriptures.

1. That death which brings some spiritual advantages even to those who are not saved, is not applicable to the elect alone: but the death of Christ brings advantages even to some who will not be saved. For the clearer understanding of the major, I now add that which I mentioned in the beginning, That under the name of *the death of Christ*, we include all that accumulation of the meritorious obedience of Christ, to which his death put as it were the last finish. For it is this infinite merit of the Mediator Christ, which God the Father beholds, when he bestows any spiritual benefit upon lost and miserable mortals in order to eternal salvation. If, therefore, it should be found, that even the non-elect receive certain benefits of this kind from the merit of Christ, then it will be evident that the death of Christ, as to some of its effects at least, is not only applicable to all men generally, but is actually applied to some who will not be saved. Let us proceed, then, to the proof of the minor, which alone can be doubted. In the first place, I ask, is it not to be esteemed of considerable advantage, that God should deign to call many even of the non-elect to repentance and faith, and, under the condition of faith, to eternal life? It is esteemed so, truly, by God himself, who calls the preaching of the Gospel, *the word of life*, (John vi. 68, Acts v. 20) *the grace of God which bringeth salvation* (Tit. ii. 11). Who says, *It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations* (Luke xxiv. 46, 47). Who, lastly, calls this preaching of the Gospel, *a treasure* (2 Cor. iv. 7), and pronounces the feet of them that preach the Gospel *beautiful* (Rom. x. 15), and threatens the taking it away as the greatest punishment (Matt. xxi. 43), and declares that they shall be most severely punished who

have despised and rejected this so great benefit. Luke x. 11, and 2 Thess. i. 8. All these things shew that the Gospel is a supernatural benefit granted even to those who abuse it. Secondly, if any one should obstinately deny that the preaching of the Gospel is a benefit granted by God to the non-elect; yet no one would deny, that the *enlightening of the mind, tasting of the heavenly gift,* communication of other supernatural gifts, which are mentioned in Hebrews vi. are great and supernatural benefits, and conferred not for this corporeal, but for that spiritual life. But all these things are frequently given to those who are not of the number of the elect; and they are given through and for the sake of Christ: For, *Out of his fulness have all we received* (John i. 16), and, *To every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.* Ephes. vi. 7. Moreover, of some supernatural gifts we rightly say with the Apostle, *All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.* 1 Cor. xii. 11. To which I add, Whatever supernatural grace is given through Christ to any man, is given from the merit of Christ: for Christ does not confer any thing upon men which he hath not first merited for them by his obedience. Thus Bernard says (Serm. 13 in Cant.), *Whatsoever wisdom, whatsoever virtue you think you have, attribute it to Christ, the virtue of God, the wisdom of God. The source of fountains and rivers is the sea: the source of virtue and knowledge is our Lord Jesus Christ.* Ambrose speaks more generally on Ephesians i. *Every gift of the grace of God is in Christ.* Lastly, even this is clear, that, in the opinion at least of all the antients, the death of Christ is, from the ordination of God, applicable also to the non-elect, because they expressly taught that it was applied in baptism for the remission of original sin to every baptised infant. Here is a principal and supernatural effect of the death of Christ, of the application of which to the non-predestinate there was no doubt in the antient Church, not even among those who held absolute predestination most rigidly. A very important witness to this is Prosper himself (Resp. 2. ad Capit. Gallor. & Sentent. 2. on the same capitula.) To

whom we may add the African Fathers, in their Synodical Epistle, and the Council of Valence, in the 5th Canon. By this first argument therefore we prove. that the meritorious efficacy of the death of Christ is not to be restricted to the elect alone, but is applicable to others from the ordination of God, and is actually applied as to certain effects.

2. He who by undergoing death by the ordination of God sustained the punishment due not only to the sins of certain individual persons, but of the whole human race; His passion, by virtue of the same ordination, is applicable not only to certain definite persons, but to every individual of the human race. But Christ by dying sustained the punishment due to the sins of the world: Therefore, he willed that his death should be, as it were, an universal cause of salvation applicable to all. He who denies the major, is bound to shew why God willed that his Son should bear the sins of the human race, if he was unwilling to appoint in his death a cause at least applicable to the human race, although the application would not follow in many. We cannot conceive any other causes of this, than that it should please the Divine goodness and wisdom to exact from our Redeemer, and as it were to receive into his own hands, an universal ransom applicable to all. 1st. That in its application the liberty of the Divine will, doing what he will with his own, and his special kindness towards the elect, might more eminently appear. 2dly. That he might afford a specimen of great mercy towards the non-elect, at least towards those who are called into the church. 3dly. That unbelievers might be convinced in their own consciences, that a mode of liberating them was not wanting on the part of Christ, but that they were wanting to themselves, according to the saying of Christ, John v. 40, *Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life.* Now let us descend to the minor, in which it is affirmed, that Christ sustained the punishment due to the sins of the human race. Thus the Scriptures speak, *All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us*

all. Isaiah liii. 6. Thus the Fathers speak, *The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is the ransom of the whole world, from which they are excluded, who, either being delighted with their captivity are unwilling to be redeemed, or after redemption have returned to the same slavery.* Prosper ad Capit. Gallor. sent. super. 9. Thus our Church of England, Article 2, *Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.* Lastly, they cannot deny this who are most accustomed to limit the death of Christ. The reverend and most learned Paræus*

* David Pareus, or Parè, was born of Protestant parents of a respectable rank, at Frankenstein, in Silesia, in 1548, and in due time put to a Grammar school there. His father, whose name as a German was Wangler, (an appellation which the son afterwards, in conformity with literary pride, commuted into a word of the same signification derived from the Greek) becoming a widower, contracted a second marriage, the consequence of which was, that his design of making his son a scholar was frustrated, and he was disposed of otherwise as speedily as possible, by being first placed with an apothecary and then transferred to a shoemaker. Providence however had ordained otherwise respecting David, and many years had not elapsed, when, from the strong bent of his son's genius towards literary pursuits, his father resumed his first design; and at about sixteen years of age he was sent to the College school of Hermsberg, and being so fortunate as to come under the instructions of Christopher Schilling, his progress in learning was equally sound and rapid. Being obliged to quit Hermsberg, owing to religious troubles, he removed in 1566, first to Amberg, and shortly after to Heidelberg, which University was then in a most flourishing condition. Here he seems to have remained till 1571, when he was appointed Curè of the Village of Schlettenbach; but being shortly after recalled to Heidelberg, after other changes and reverses, he finally settled there in 1584; he obtained different Professorships in the University, and entered warmly into the controversies carrying on between the Lutherans and the Calvinists, and printed his "Method of the Ubiquitarian Controversy." He acquired the esteem of the Elector Palatine and other persons of high rank and consideration, and in 1589 printed, under their auspices, an Edition of the Scriptures in German with Notes. In 1592 he was elected an Ecclesiastical Counsellor, and the year following took his Doctor's Degree with great eclat. In 1617 there was kept an Evangelical Jubilee, in commemoration of the Church's deliverance from Popery an hundred years before. The solemnities were held three days, during which there were continual orations, disputations, poems, and sermons suited to the occasion. Pareus published some pieces on the subject, which drew upon him the resentment of the Jesuits of Mentz, who wrote a sharp censure upon him,

in his judgment of the second article of the Remonstrants, which he transmitted to the Synod of Dort, has these words, *The cause and matter of the passion of Christ was the sense and sustaining of the anger of God excited against the sin, not of some men, but of the whole human race; whence it arises, that the whole of sin and of the wrath of God against it was endured by Christ, but the whole of reconciliation was not obtained or restored to all.* Act. Synod. Dordrect. p. 217. The force of the argument is, He who willed and ordained that Christ the Mediator should sustain the wrath of God due to the sins not of certain persons, but of the whole human race, He willed that this passion of Christ should be a remedy applicable to the human race, that is, to each and every man, and not only to certain individual persons; supreme power being nevertheless left to himself, and full liberty of dispensing and applying this infinite merit according to the secret good pleasure of his will.

to which he replied. In this year also appeared a "Commentary of his on the Epistle to the Romans," which acquired great fame, and was speedily dispersed all over Europe. This gave such offence to our King, James I., by doctrines promulgated in it supposed to militate against regal prerogatives, that he ordered it to be burnt publicly in London by the common hangman. In 1619, Pareus, at the instance of the States-General, was pressed to go to the Synod of Dort; but he excused himself from becoming a deputy on account of his age and infirmities; though he wrote to the Synod his judgment on topics in dispute. He was very averse to all innovations in points of doctrine. He would not suffer any man to deviate a tittle from the Catechism of Ursinus, relative to Justification, and strenuously resisted, like a brave champion for the established doctrine, alterations in the Catechism of Heidelberg. These innovations, he alleged, were a removal of the boundaries of truth, which ought to be sacred and immoveable. He even maintained that the humour of innovating foreboded an approaching ruin to the Church. He used to say with Luther, *From a vain-glorious teacher, a litigious pastor, and useless questions, deliver thy Church, Good Lord!* He was a great advocate for peace; and though he enjoyed little in his latter days, being obliged to flee from Heidelburg on account of the reverses that took place there, he yet returned, resolved to fetch his last breath in a beloved retreat he had formed at it; and dying in peace at his Pareanum in 1622, he was interred with all the honours his College could bestow on his memory.

Of Pareus's Opera Exegetica, 4 vols. folio, 1647, Mr. Bickersteth in his "Christian Student" observes:—"Have too much of what is valuable to be omitted in this list."

3. Whoever from the ordination of God may be called to believe in the Mediator, and they who by believing may obtain eternal life, to them the death of Christ from the previous ordination of God is applicable for salvation: But every living person may be called to believe in the Mediator, and by believing, according to the evangelical covenant, may obtain eternal life: Therefore, the death of Christ is applicable to every living person. The connexion of the major appears from hence, that a real call to believe presupposes an object prepared in which to believe, and this very *possibility of being saved by believing* implies a saving object, that is, That the death or merit of Christ was ordained as a remedy applicable to him to whom such a benefit is promised under the condition of faith. For if he should be called to faith in Christ to whom Christ was not applicable from the ordination of God, faith would be required in a false object, or rather in none at all as to the person called. For it would be the same as if the preacher of the Gospel should call upon a devil in human form, and living among men, to believe in Christ, and should promise eternal life to him, if he would believe. Such a call would be erroneous on the part of the person calling, and useless on the part of the called; because he is called to believe in Christ, to whom Christ from the ordination of God is not applicable; and salvation is promised to him under a condition, to whom, although he should be supposed to believe, salvation would nevertheless be denied on account of a defect of the sacrifice and covenant pertaining to him. This is not the case with any living person; therefore it must be confessed that the death of Christ is applicable to every one under the conditions of the evangelical covenant. The major being proved, I pass to the minor, which ought to be incontrovertible among all the orthodox. For although the providence of God does not procure that every individual should know the Gospel, and so that all should be called to Christ; yet God himself has appointed that the Gospel should be a thing really to be announced to all. *Go and preach to every*

creature. If any one preacher could go over the whole world, and come to every individual mortal, it would be lawful for him to offer Christ to every man, and, under the condition of faith, to announce and promise salvation to be obtained through Christ. For thus the Apostle himself speaks, Romans iii. 21, 22, *Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference.* The most learned Belgic Professors, in their judgment exhibited at the Synod of Dort, confess the same thing (Act. Synod. Dordr. p. 88). *We confess,* say they, *that the merit and value of the death of Christ is not only sufficient to expiate all, even the greatest sins of men, but also those of the whole posterity of Adam, although there should be many more to be saved, provided they embraced it with a true faith.* But it would not be sufficient to save all, even if all should believe, unless it be true that by the ordination of God this death is an appointed remedy applicable to all. If it be denied that Christ died for some persons, it will immediately follow, that such could not be saved by the death of Christ, even if they should believe. What is usually answered to this argument by some, viz. *That God has not commanded his ministers to announce that Christ died for every individual, whether they believe or not, but only for believing and penitent sinners, and therefore it cannot be demonstrated from the universality of the call, that the death of Christ is, according to the ordination of God, an universal remedy applicable to all,* seems to me to be said very inconsiderately. For faith is not previously required in mankind, as a condition, which makes Christ to have died for them, but which makes the death of Christ, which is applicable to all from the Divine loving-kindness to man, actually applied and beneficial to individuals. The death of Christ was a sacrifice established in the Divine mind, and ordained for men from the beginning of the world; nor could it profit any one if he should believe, unless it had been offered for him before he believed. When therefore we announce to any one, that the death of

Christ would profit him if he believed, we presume that it was destined for him, as applicable before he believed.

4. If all men, as soon as the doctrine of the Gospel concerning Christ the Redeemer enduring death on account of the sins of mankind, is made known to them, are bound to be grateful and obedient to Christ, then it is certain that this work of the Redeemer in offering himself as a sacrifice to God, is to be considered as a benefit generally applicable to all; for there is no cause why we should say that they are bound to gratitude, or to the duties of obedience, on account of the death of Christ, who are altogether excluded from that benefit: But an Apostle testifies that every man may be excited to obedience by this argument. For to all men, after this mystery of the death of Christ has been opened to them, that may be truly said which is contained in 1 Cor. vi. 20, *Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's.* And also in 2 Cor. v. 15, *He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again.* Unless the death of Christ be understood as a remedy applicable to all, the foundation on which the ministers of the Gospel build exhortations of this kind, will be always uncertain, and often false: Always uncertain, because it cannot be known by men who are the elect. Often false, as often indeed as it is exhibited to the non-elect, who by this kind of redemption are not bound to live to Christ, unless it be presupposed that the sacrifice offered by Christ for the redemption of the world was for them. Moreover, Christ could not claim for himself any supreme dominion over each and every man in right of his death, unless the merit of his death were, according to the ordination of God, applicable to all for salvation. Since, then, *To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living,* Romans xiv. 9, we ought, to extend his death to all, at least as to the right and power of a saving application; although the Spirit of Christ (who bloweth where he listeth) gives to men the faculty and

will of applying, as well as the benefit of the death applied, *according* to *the decree* of his special mercy.

5. That work which truly and deservedly, as soon as it is understood to have been agreed upon between God the Father and the Son, gives to Christ the name of the *Redeemer of the world* and *Saviour of the world,* is to be acknowledged as an universal cause of salvation, or an universal remedy, applicable to the whole human race: But such was the work of the obedience of Christ unto the death of the cross; Therefore it is applicable to the whole human race. The major is confirmed from hence, that on account of the price paid, Christ would be only a partial Redeemer and Saviour, if the price paid were not, according to the ordination of God, applicable to every individual of the human race. We therefore, who give to Christ the title of *Redeemer and Saviour of the world,* ought at the same time to grant, that this redemption from whence he is so named, was the payment of the price due for the liberating of the human race; which so far avails with God, that he cannot require any other satisfaction in order to reconcile any man to himself; and it is so far profitable to us all, that any sinner may be delivered, provided he should believe in this Redeemer, and (what in respect to remedies ought to be done) should apply to himself this saving medicine by faith. In this sense we truly say, that Christ died for all men, and that this death of Christ, or redemption acquired by his death, is a merit applicable to all men individually, which cannot in any way be affirmed of the fallen angels. Christ Jesus is, therefore, the Redeemer and Saviour of all men *causally,* as the Schoolmen say, that is, by instituting and supplying a sufficient cause, ordained and accepted by God, for expiating the sins of all those who are willing to make use of this remedy. This is a sufficient foundation for the title of *universal Saviour and Redeemer,* although the will of believing is not given to all. Now let us go to the minor, which is so plain that it does not need any laborious proof. The Scriptures, by viewing this death of Christ as applicable to all, call

him, *the Saviour of the world;* John iv. 42, *This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.* They call the death of Christ, *a ransom for all,* 1 Tim. ii. 6, given for the redemption of all, and *the propitiation for the sins of the whole world,* 1 John ii. 2. The Catholic church also, in her public prayers, has always named Christ *the Redeemer of the world.* But lest any one should pervert titles of this kind to that sense, as if Christ were called the Redeemer of the world because he hath effectually redeemed the elect dispersed through the whole world, I add this at the last, that both the Fathers and modern writers have asserted, that Christ is the Redeemer of the world in the sense laid down by us, namely, because his death is a ransom from the ordination of God applicable to all men individually. To this those words of Prosper apply (Ad Object. Vincentian. Resp. 1.) *On account of one nature of all and one cause of all undertaken in truth by our Lord, all are rightly said to be redeemed, although all are not delivered from captivity.* And a little after, *The cup of immortality which is made up of our infirmity and Divine virtue, hath indeed in itself what may be beneficial to all, but if it is not drunk, it does not heal.* Those words of Musculus before quoted refer to the same thing (Common-places, p. 151). *We know that all do not become partakers of this redemption, but the perdition of those who are not saved does not prevent it from being called universal redemption. For it does not arise from any defect in the grace of God that reprobates do not receive it, nor is it just that on account of the sons of perdition it should lose the glory and title of universal redemption, since it is prepared for all and all are called to it.* From all which it appears, that Christ is rightly called the Redeemer and Saviour of the world, because he has brought to the whole human race a remedy applicable to the procuring of the salvation of every individual.

6. If it was the counsel and will of God, that Christ by dying should pay to Him a most full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction, not only to deliver those who believe in the benefit of God, and thus eventually are saved, but

also for those who continue in unbelief through their own fault, and thus eventually are condemned, then it must be confessed that this death of Christ is a remedy from the nature of the thing, and the ordination of God, applicable to all: But such was the counsel and will of God; which is evinced from the Divine promises, which make known his will to us. For God has promised salvation, under the condition of faith and repentance, even to those who would never perform those conditions. Thus remission is promised to Cain, if he should repent. Gen. iv. 7. Which salvation, or remission of sins, conditionally promised to such a person, clearly proves that a cause of salvation was procured and applicable to the same person, under the aforesaid condition. The same is evinced in that God in the work of redemption hath so ordered his counsel that no man can truly complain that he perished through a defect in the expiatory sacrifice. But he to whom the death of Christ is not applicable for salvation as a remedy according to the will of God, may not less truly affirm that a sacrifice was wanting for him, than for the wicked angels, for whom under no condition is the death of Christ ordained. And this is that counsel which the Pharisees are said to have despised. Luke vii. 30.

7. If according to the order and nature of the things themselves, and our consideration of them, the death and merit of Christ is to be assumed as a thing ordained and destined by God for the good of the human race before it can be understood for whom faith was destined, then it is necessary to consider it as a cause of salvation applicable to all before it be determined that it is applied or infallibly to be applied to this or that person. The argument of the consequence is this, That it is understood that the death or merit of Christ is not applied, nor to be applied to any one, until it is presupposed that faith is granted or to be granted to him. And on the contrary, the death of Christ is considered to be applicable to any one, before it is conceived that faith is denied or to be denied to him for ever. Now I add the minor, namely,

that the death or merit of Christ, in his infinite mercy, ought to be considered as a thing determined on and destined for men before faith is destined for any individual persons. Which appears, in the first place, because the death or merit of Christ is the object of faith. But to what purpose would have been the gift of faith to Peter or Paul, unless a saving remedy had first been ordained applicable to any one through faith? Further, faith, like all other saving gifts, is conferred upon men on account of Christ and through his merit; therefore, in the order of the Divine decrees, the death of Christ precedes the faith of every Christian. To this those words of the Divines of the Palatinate refer, in their judgment exhibited at the Synod of Dort (Art. Synod. Dordrecht. page 88), *The faith of the elect does not precede, but follows the death of Christ, because his death is the cause of faith, on account of which the elect are given to Christ, and the object of faith, which it beholds and embraces.* Finally, it is decreed, that through the death of the second Adam, salvation is procurable for all men who are lost in the first Adam, before it is decreed to whom it may be given effectually and infallibly, and to whom it may not be given. It is to be confessed, therefore, that the Mediator Jesus Christ, with his death and the infinite treasure of his merits, is, from the ordination of God, applicable for salvation to the whole human race, although the most free, most just, most secret good pleasure of God intervenes, according to which he determines that faith (through means of which application is made) should be infallibly given to certain persons and not given to others. But why, in dispensing the treasure of the merits of Christ, which is sufficient for and applicable to all men individually, he acts so unequally with persons in equal circumstances, we ought not to inquire, since we cannot ascertain, but with the Apostle acquiesce in the secret will of God, *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.* Romans ix. 18. *No one hath first given to him, that it should be recompensed unto him again.* Romans xi. 35.

8. The last argument is taken from a comparison of the twofold covenant, and according to it, of a twofold ordination of men to salvation. As, therefore, in the covenant of nature, that is, the agreement with Adam at the time of creation, salvation was procurable by Adam and all his posterity under the condition of obedience to be paid to the law of nature, and to the express commandment of God; so in the covenant of grace, which was confirmed by the blood of the Mediator, salvation is also understood to be procurable for all men under the condition published in the Gospel, that is, of faith in this Mediator, who hath made satisfaction for the sins of the human race. Moreover, as in the first covenant, God, who ordained salvation as procurable for Adam and his posterity, yet did not predestinate that either Adam himself or any of his posterity should be really saved by that covenant; so God, who in the second covenant ordained salvation as procurable for all under the condition of faith, yet hath not predestinated to give to all men individually this faith, by which they might infallibly obtain salvation. But lest the blood of the Son of God should flow, and through the fault of the human will the same should happen in the second covenant which had happened in the first, namely, that no one should enjoy the benefit of it, God resolved with himself a more deep and secret counsel, and determined of his mere and special mercy to give to some persons the ability and will to fulfil the aforesaid condition of faith, and further, that they should actually and infallibly fulfil it. But now, as he would be unjust towards God who should deny that salvation was ordained by God as procurable for Adam and his posterity under the covenant of nature; so he is more unjust towards Christ, who denies that his death was ordained by God, as a remedy for salvation applicable to all under the condition of the new covenant, although many do not obtain salvation by means of it. God himself gave to the world this remedy applicable to all mankind individually; let the world concede to God the liberty of applying it, as it may seem

good to his wisdom and justice. Those who think in this manner of the death of Christ do not take away that common loving-kindness of God, of which the Scripture testifies; and yet at the same time they contend, that as many as are saved by the merit of the death of Christ, are saved by special and undeserved grace; and that as many as are not saved, perish through their own unbelief, or at least, through their own fault. I omit bringing forward any more arguments to corroborate this our opinion. Let us now attend to what is wont to be objected on the other side.

CHAPTER III.

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS.

Before we explain those things which may be objected on the other side, it should be premised, that we do not undertake the cause of those who declare that Christ by his death obtained remission of sins, reconciliation with God, and a state of salvation for each and every man. Thus Borreus* seems to think with Arminius† (Reply of Armin. to Artic. 13, 14), who, leaning on this foundation, asserts, that all infants of all nations dying without actual sins, are saved, because God hath taken the whole human race into the grace of reconciliation. He thinks therefore that by the sacrifice of the death of Christ the whole human race was placed in a state of salvation, from which if they should not fall, they will undoubtedly obtain salvation. Many persons ascribe the same error to Huberus and Puccius. But our defence is, not indeed that by this death of Christ salvation is actually obtained for all man-

* Adrian vander Borre, one of the ministers of Leyden; a Remonstrant. *Brandt's Reformation in the Low Countries*, Vol. III. p. 351.

† After what has been said relative to this eminent man in the life of Bishop Davenant, prefixed to these Volumes (see Life; Vol. I. pp. xii—xiv.) any thing further is almost unnecessary. Nor, while pursuing the course he has adopted towards others, need the Editor do more in this instance than remind the Reader that, as in the case of Calvin, the name of Arminius has been applied to many whose loose theology he would have despised, and whose irreligious practice he would have abhorred. It must be remembered, that it was *the extremes of Ultra-Calvinism* which reluctantly dragged him into the field of controversy—a scene ill-suited to the meek piety and humility of his temper; that the support of his views exposed him to persecution and reproach of the bitterest kind; to which there is no doubt his life was sacrificed; and that the whole tenor of his conduct, under circumstances the most trying, and the patient and fervent faith which he exemplified in the excruciating torments of the bed of death, evince, as it

kind, or that by its benefit each and every man is received into favour, and placed in such a state as, if he should continue in it, he would possess eternal life: But that this death of Christ is, according to the determination of the Divine will, a remedy applicable for salvation to the whole human race, or to every individual of the human race, although in procuring and effecting its application, God in an especial manner has compassion on some, and not on others. You have heard this sentiment in some measure confirmed by arguments. We will now vindicate it from the objections which may be brought against it on the other side.

Objection 1. First, therefore, it may be objected, That at the time when Christ suffered death, many had been adjudged to hell, and tormented there, but there is no redemption from hell: How then can we contend that the death of Christ was ever applicable in any way to these condemned persons? Some, influenced by this argument, have concluded that the innumerable multitude of the wicked, who lived from the beginning of the world until the coming of Christ, and who, on account of their impiety, were cast into hell, had no more right in the benefit of redemption, before the sacrifice of Christ was offered up on the cross, than the devils themselves. Thus the Leyden Fathers speak in a writing which is extant in Vol. 9. Biblioth. Patrum, *As the Lord Jesus Christ is by no means said to have suffered for the wicked and condemned angels, so it is not to be believed that he suffered all things for those impious and condemned men.*

Reply 1. But I answer, When we affirm the death of Christ according to the ordination of God, and the nature of the thing, to be a remedy applicable to every man, we consider not merely the outward passion of Christ endured

ought to be acknowledged by every upright mind, that he was a sincere disciple and servant of the blessed Jesus.—In regard to the writings of Arminius, it may suffice to cite the remark of an eminently useful and candid Author. "Some modern writers," says he, "would be surprised to find how Calvinistic Arminius is. He would certainly have been viewed by them as a Calvinist." *Bickersteth's Christian Student.*

at the appointed moment of time, but the eternal virtue of the death of Christ, bringing salvation to mankind in every age. For Christ, as to the intention of God, was *a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,* and the efficacy of this propitiatory sacrifice could extend itself as much to those who lived before Christ suffered, as to us who live after his passion. If therefore they only mean, that those could not be relieved by the death of Christ in time, who before his death were by an irrevocable decree adjudged to infernal punishment, we confess the same; because they had then ceased to be living in this world, and therefore were not capable of repentance and faith; but if they mean to contend further, that the eternal virtue of the death of Christ was not applicable to such persons while they were alive in this world, because the passion of Christ did not regard them any more than the wicked and condemned angels, that we deny. For it may be truly said of Cain, Esau, or any man who died before Christ suffered, that he might have been absolved from his sins, and saved through the virtue of the sacrifice to be offered up by the Messiah, if he had believed in him; which cannot be said of the condemned angels: because the universal covenant of salvation under the condition of faith, embraces the whole human race, but does not embrace the fallen angels. It is therefore worthy of observation, that God would not that the death of his Christ should either be applied or applicable under any condition to any of the fallen angels: to all these, therefore, God conducted himself alike and equally. But not equally to mankind; for as to these, although he determined and declared that the death of his Son was applicable to any one under the condition of faith, yet he did not determine to cause it by the benefit of his special mercy to be applied equally to every one. We do not deny therefore what is evident, namely, that the difereuce between devils and men consists in this, that from the ordination of God, the death of Christ is a thing ordained for and applicable to mankind; but neither ordained for, nor applicable to devils; although after this life, to men placed in hell there is no further possibility of appli-

cation remaining. Therefore this consequence is faulty; viz. The death of Christ was not applicable to the damned after their condemnation; Therefore it was never and in no way applicable to them.

Objection 2. Those who say that the death of Christ is applicable, from the ordination of God, to every individual, at the same time affirm, that God has provided for many persons a remedy, which he foresaw would never profit them. For God knew that none of the reprobate would be healed by the medicine of the blood of Christ, and delivered from eternal death. To what purpose therefore would he ordain so precious a remedy to be applicable even to those to whom it was most certain that it would never be applied?

Reply 2. You cannot on that account infer, that it rightly follows from our opinion, that this remedy, even by the ordination and appointment of God himself, is applicable to innumerable persons to whom it will never be actually applied. I deny, therefore, that any thing false or inconvenient can be deduced from thence, although this be granted. Yea, it is evident, that many benefits have been provided by God for angels and men, I may also add, and conferred sometimes, and duly ordained to a certain end, which God at the same time knew would never profit them, nor avail to produce such an end. Those excellent gifts, which were conferred upon the apostate angels in their first creation, were duly ordained by God to produce in them firm and constant obedience, and to secure their blessedness; yet God knew that they would be rebellious, and would never use those gifts to the obtaining of that good for which they were destined. The same may be said of Adam in his state of uprightness, whom God endued with knowledge and holiness, and guarded with admonitions abundantly sufficient to preserve him in his duty; knowing at the same time that all these things, which were applicable to the promotion of his obedience and felicity, would never be applied. It is not therefore foreign to Divine wisdom to appoint and ordain means applicable to a certain end, although he may under-

stand that the application would be hindered by some intervening obstacle, which he had not determined to remove. Here may be adduced that question of Aquinas on predestination, where he makes a difference between *providence* commonly taken, and *predestination*, which is a special part of providence. *Providence*, he says, *respects only an order to an end: predestination respects the end or event of an order. Those things which are ordained to an end by that more common providence, do not always obtain the end; but those things which are ordained by an individual predestination always obtain it.* As therefore God, by that more extensive providence, is understood to have provided many bodily remedies applicable to the removing of certain bodily diseases from any persons, which nevertheless he hath not determined to be infallibly applied to any particular individuals; so also we affirm that God of his love to man, and that more common providence, hath provided and ordained the blood of his Son as a remedy applicable to the expiation of the sins of mankind in general, although he hath not determined from his individual predestination to have it applied to all men individually. But for what purpose is that ordained as applicable to all men, which is not intended to be infallibly applied to all? I answer, that from hence the good-will, mercy, and justice of God may appear more conspicuous, whilst that remedy which, from the ordination of God, is applicable to every one for salvation, is applied nevertheless only to certain persons, to whom God shews his compassion in a special manner; it is not applied to others, although God promises it and sets it before them, through their own wickedness.

Objection 3. If the death of Christ, by the ordination of God, is a remedy applicable to all for salvation, then God would take care that this death of Christ should be announced to all, lest any one might pretend that he perished only through ignorance of so efficacious a remedy. But experience teaches, that this remedy was not revealed, for some ages, not only to many individuals, but also to many nations: Therefore that was not appointed by God to be a remedy applicable to all men individually,

which was concealed from so many, God himself so ordering it.

Reply 3. We willingly concede what relates to the minor proposition; which also the sacred Scriptures testify, and the Fathers acknowledge to be most true. In Acts xiv. 16, Paul shews, that *in times past God suffered all nations to walk in their own ways*, without any knowledge of Christ. And on this account, in Colossians i. 26, 27, he calls the Gospel of Christ, *the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints, to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles.* Hence Prosper says On free-will; *It is not removed from common observation in how many ages what an innumerable multitude of men have died in their errors and impieties, without any knowledge of the true God.* And, On the calling of the Gentiles (lib. ii. cap 7), *In the extreme parts of the world there are some nations, on whom the grace of the Saviour hath not yet shone.* The minor proposition, therefore, being granted, we say that the consequence of the major is invalid. For God is not bound to procure the application of his remedy to any individual to whom he hath willed that it should be applicable; which is evident as well in corporeal as in spiritual remedies. Although, therefore, the death of Christ is, from the ordination of God, and the nature of the thing, a remedy of that kind, that it may be both announced and applied to every individual of the human race for the remission of sins, yet God is not bound by any promise to procure that it should be announced and actually applied to every individual. God willed that the death of his Son should be a treasure as it were deposited in his own hands, from whence he might dispense to the whole human race whatsoever regards the obtaining either of pardon, or grace, or glory: but he willed also that the actual communication of this treasure should remain in his own most free power, and from thence he should bestow it upon men according to the good pleasure of his own will. *Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?* Matt. xx. 15. We say, therefore, that the death

and merit of Christ is, according to the revealed will of God, applicable to all men; and in this sense, that Christ died for all men, but not for the apostate angels. But this being assumed, we affirm nevertheless that God, who has absolute authority over his own gift, is not bound to make known, nor to apply this medicine to all mankind. So Augustine says, *Whom he will not relieve, he does not relieve; of whom in his predestination, he hath otherwise determined, secretly indeed, but justly. For there is no iniquity with God, but his judgments are inscrutable.* Nor yet (as it was objected) will any one perish through ignorance alone of the remedy. For in all that perish there will be found causes why they perish, arising from their own demerits, their aforesaid ignorance accompanying only, not causing, their perdition. *Thou hast destroyed thyself,* &c.

Objection 4. If the death of Christ is to be considered as a remedy or ransom applicable to every man, from the ordination of God, then also the resurrection, intercession, and mediation of Christ will have respect to all men in the same manner. But Christ was not raised up for all men, does not intercede for all, is not the mediator of all: Therefore, neither is his death to be extended to all. That these are never to be separated is proved from Romans viii. 34, where they are all joined together. *It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* And Romans iv. 25, the Apostle teaches, that those for whose offences Christ died, for their justification he was raised again. But he was not raised again for all men; Therefore, neither did he die for all.

Reply 4. If the ground of our defence be rightly weighed, it will easily appear that all these things are no detriment to our cause. For we do not contend that the death of Christ was, from the ordination of God, so applicable to each and every man, that on account of this propitiatory sacrifice, all men are at once placed in a state of grace and salvation; nor do we defend this, that from the special decree of God and of predestination, this death of Christ is infallibly to be applied to each and every man;

but that this death of Christ, God so ordaining it and re-revealing it in his word, is that ransom by which the sins of any man may be expiated who performs the conditions required in the Gospel. And hence it is that the preacher of the Gospel may confidently announce to every man in every part of the world, that salvation is procurable for him in the death of the Son of God, if he should believe. This cannot be promised to any of the fallen angels. Whence it is clear, that this conditional promise of salvation in the death of Christ, which may be announced to every man is founded on some ordination of the will of God, which regards men universally and individually, and does not regard angels. But let the opponents say what this ordination is, if it is not that which we assert concerning the death of Christ being applicable to the human race under the conditions of the Gospel. These things being so determined, we come nearer to the solution of the aforesaid objection, that the death of Christ pertains to all men individually, as to his death itself, or the oblation made on the cross. For as we can truly announce to every man that his sins are expiable by the death of Christ according to the ordination of God, and will be expiated, if only he should believe in Christ; so also we can truly declare, that the same Christ was raised again, that he might justify him through faith, and was exalted at the right hand of God, that, by his mediation and merits, he might preserve him through faith in the favour of God, and at length might lead him to glory. Therefore we do not put asunder those things which God hath joined together; but we teach, that the death, resurrection, and intercession of Christ are joined together in indissoluble union, but in a different way. If we consider the whole human race, that is, each and every man, then we say, not only that the death, but the resurrection and intercession of Christ regards them, as to the possibility of their enjoying these benefits, the condition of faith being pre-supposed. If we consider the elect, we affirm that all these things regard them as to the infallibility of enjoying them, because of this condition of faith being destined for, and in time be-

stowed upon them. Although, therefore, in some special way, the death and resurrection of Christ, with the great treasure of his merits, may be restricted to the elect alone (of which we shall discourse afterwards), yet it is not to be denied that the death and merits of Christ, *who took the one nature of all, and undertook the one cause of all,* are of that kind, that they may be announced, offered, and by faith applied to every individual partaker of human nature. This Christ himself hath indicated in a manner sufficiently clear, in those words, John iii 17, 18, *God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved; he that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.* Those, therefore, who never believe, nor will believe, would nevertheless have had life procurable through the death and merits *of Christ,* according to the ordination of God, if they had believed.

Objection 5. If the death of Christ be a benefit from the ordination of God, applicable to each and every man, then it may be said, that Christ made satisfaction for the sins of the whole human race. But this cannot be defended, without at the same time overthrowing the justice of God, since the idea of justice does not admit that the same sin should be punished twice. Suppose, then, that the death of Christ is a ransom, by which satisfaction was made to God for the sins of the human race, how can so many persons be called to account for the same by the justice of God, and be tormented with eternal punishment?

Reply 5. As to the major proposition, we think its consequence may be safely conceded. For the orthodox Fathers boldly assert that Christ made satisfaction for the sins of the human race or of all mankind. Thus Eusebius, (Evang. Demonstr. lib. x. in the preface) *It was needful that the Lamb of God should be offered as a sacrifice for the other lambs whose nature he assumed, even for the whole human race.* Thus Nazianzen (Orat. 2. in Pasch.) *The sacrifice of Christ is an imperishable expiation of the whole world.* Thus, finally (omitting others), Cyril (Catech. 13.), *He redeemed*

the whole world of mankind. The same form of speaking is every where made use of in the Articles of religion of our Church of England, (Art. 2, 15, 31, &c.) Thus also those speak who endeavour to limit to the utmost this death of Christ. We adduced before the testimony of the Reverend Heidelberg Divine Pareus, who freely confesses in his judgment exhibited at the Synod of Dort, *The cause and matter of the passion of Christ was a feeling or sustaining of the wrath of God, incensed by the sin, not of some men, but of the whole human race.* A little afterwards, *The whole of sin and of the wrath of God against it, is affirmed to have been borne by Christ.* Nor ought this to appear unsound, since this universal redemption, satisfaction, or expiation performed by the death of Christ, brings nothing more than an universal cause of salvation to be confirmed and granted to the human race by the Divine ordination; the benefit of which every individual may enjoy through the faith required by the Gospel. We therefore call Christ the Redeemer of the world, and teach that he made satisfaction for the sins not of some, but of the whole world, not because that on account of the payment of this price for the sins of the human race, all mankind individually are to be immediately delivered from captivity and death, but because by virtue of the payment of this price, all men individually may and ought to be delivered from death, and, in fact, are to be delivered according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant, that is, if they repent and believe in this Redeemer. To what is further urged, That it is contrary to justice to receive satisfaction or a ransom for the sins of the whole human race, and yet not to deliver them all from the punishment of their sins, but, notwithstanding this satisfaction, to adjudge many to eternal torments; I answer, That this would indeed be most unjust, if we of ourselves had paid this price to God, or if our Surety, Jesus Christ, had so offered to God his blood as a satisfactory price, that without any other intervening condition, all men should be immediately absolved through the offering of the oblation made by him; or, finally, if God himself had covenanted with Christ when he died, that he would give faith

to every individual, and all those other things which regard the infallible application of this sacrifice which was offered up for the human race. But since God himself of his own accord provided that this price should be paid to himself, it was in his own power to annex conditions, which being performed, this death should be advantageous to any man, not being performed it should not profit any man. Therefore no injustice is done to those persons who are punished by God after the ransom was accepted for the sins of the human race, because they offered nothing to God as a satisfaction for their sins, nor performed that condition, without the performance of which God willed not that this satisfactory price should benefit any individual. Nor, moreover, ought this to be thought an injustice to Christ the Mediator. For he so was willing to die for all, and to pay to the Father the price of redemption for all, that at the same time he willed not that every individual in any way whatsoever, but that all, as soon as they believed in him, should be absolved from the guilt of their sins. Lastly, Christ, in offering himself in sacrifice to God the Father in order to expiate the sins of the world, nevertheless submitted to the good pleasure of the Father the free distribution and application of his merits, neither was any agreement entered into between the Father and the Son, by which God is bound to effect that this death of Christ, which, from the ordination of God, is applicable to all under the condition of faith, should become applied to all by the gift of faith. We ought not, therefore, to deny that the offering of Christ once made is a perfect satisfaction for the sins, not of some men only, but of all; yet so that he who is simply said to have died for all, promises remission of sin through his death and salvation conditionally, and will perform it to those alone who believe. We will illustrate all these things by a similitude; Suppose that a number of men were cast into prison by a certain King on account of a great debt, or that they were condemned to suffer death for high treason; but that the King himself procured that his own Son should discharge this debt to the last farthing; or should substitute himself

as guilty in the room of those traitors, and should suffer the punishment due to them all, this condition being at the same time promulgated both by the King and his Son, That none should be absolved or liberated except those only who should acknowledge the King's Son for their Lord and serve him: These things being so determined, I enquire, if those who persist in disobedience and rebellion against the King's Son should not be delivered, would any charge of injustice be incurred, because after this ransom had been paid, their own debts should be exacted from many, or after the punishment endured by the Son, these rebels should nevertheless be punished? By no means; because the payment of the just price, and the enduring of the punishment was ordained to procure remission for every one under the condition of obedience, and not otherwise. I shall add no more; it will be easy to accommodate all these things to our present purpose.

Objection 6. No medium can be found or thought of between the sufficiency of the price, and its real application; those, therefore, who deny that the real application of the death of Christ is made to all, ought not to proceed further than to assert the sufficiency of this price for all; beyond which they are necessarily compelled to concede its real application to all. But those who declare this death of Christ to be, according to the ordination of God, applicable to all for salvation, seem to introduce some medium between the sufficient value and the actual efficacy of it. But of what kind will it be, or where will it be found? It cannot be any efficiency indifferently regarding all men individually, and caused in them by the death of Christ, because such an effect cannot be assigned. Nor can we by virtue of the death of Christ, place in God himself either any obtaining of remission of sins extended to all, or any intention of its application. It remains, therefore, that we assert, that beyond the sufficiency of the price, nothing redounds to the death of Christ which has regard to all men.

Reply 6. To meet this objection, we should observe, in the first place, what kind of sufficiency they mean who

reason thus, and at the same time retain the distinction of the Schoolmen, *that Christ died for all men sufficiently, for the elect effectually.* Therefore, that Christ died for all men sufficiently, they understand thus: The death of Christ is sufficient to redeem all men, but he would not die for all: The death of Christ is in itself, and in its intrinsic value, a sufficient ransom for all, but it was not paid for all. But it never occurred to the Schoolmen to defend this sufficiency only, and to deny absolutely that Christ died for all. Nor can it easily be explained how, without evident contradiction, it can be affirmed, that Christ died or was offered up sufficiently for all, and at the same time be altogether denied that he was unwilling to die or be offered up for many. As to those, therefore, who admit such an oblation and sufficiency in the death of Christ as is merely hypothetical, if it is referred to all, I answer, That a medium can and ought to be assigned between that mere sufficiency of price and its real application. For the ordination of God manifested in the Gospel, according to which this death of Christ is proposed to be received by every one that repents and believes, proves that this sufficiency and actual application is appointed as a kind of medium. For in this ordination of God, according to which the death of Christ is appointed and proposed as a cause of salvation to every living person, applicable by faith, there is contained less than in the real application, but there is contained something more than in the mere and bare sufficiency of the thing considered in itself, this conditional ordination being excluded, which regards every partaker of human nature. This, therefore, is that very medium which the adversaries deny can be assigned, but still urge and enquire, what that medium is, and where it is to be found, which goes beyond the bare sufficiency, and yet does not attain to the real application. I answer, That there is not any act, caused by the death of Christ, indifferently regarding every individual; but there is a title to eternal life, founded on the death of Christ, indifferently regarding every individual under the condition of faith: That there is not in God an obtaining of remission, and a

design of application extended to all men individually according to the infallible order of predestination; but there is in God a certain obligation to remission, and a will of remitting sins and conferring life extended to all men individually, according to the tenor of the promise of the Gospel. But I say no more on this subject at present, because when we come to our next proposition, we shall designedly discourse of this same point more copiously.

Objection 7. The will of the Father, the oblation of the Son, the saving operation of the Holy Spirit, equally extend to and respect the same persons: But it is the will of the Father to save the elect alone: and the Spirit, by giving faith and perseverance, actually saves the elect alone: Therefore the death or oblation of Christ is not to be extended except to the elect alone; and therefore it ought not to be considered as a remedy from the ordination of God applicable to each and every man.

Reply 7. If the major proposition is understood concerning the will of God in predestinating, which is always joined with the infallibility of the event; and concerning that special operation of the sanctifying Spirit, which is subservient to the execution of this decree; I say that it is not absolutely true: for the death or oblation of Christ regards in some way certain persons whom predestination does not embrace. Predestination is the secret decree of God by which he determined with himself from eternity to whom he would infallibly give efficacious grace and eternal life through the infinite merit of the death of Christ: But the oblation of Christ on the cross is a common benefit granted to the human race, by virtue of which any one who only embraces it with a true faith, may claim for himself eternal life according to the will of God revealed in the Gospel. So Christ himself speaks, John iii. 14, 15, *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* Although, therefore, the predestination of God, and effectual vocation, which depends upon it, embraces no one not elected, yet, as the offering of Christ in the Gospel, so also the oblation of

Christ on the cross, is of wider extent, and is as far applicable as it is announceable, and will bring salvation to every one provided he believes it. At the same time we leave to God his own secret will, according to which he hath mercifully determined to work effectually in some that they may believe, and to leave others to their inherent obduracy, and not to work effectually in them that they may believe. I add further, That there was in Christ himself a will according to which he willed that his death should regard all men individually; and there was also a will according to which he willed that it should pertain to the elect alone. He willed that it should regard all the posterity of Adam who should be saved, and that it should actually save them all, provided they should embrace it with a true faith. He willed that it should so pertain to the elect alone, that by the merit of it all things which relate to the obtaining of salvation, should be infallibly given to them. And in this sense we confess that the oblation of Christ is of the same extent as the predestination of God. Of which more will be said hereafter.

Objection 8. If the death of Christ is determined to be applicable to each and every man according to the ordination of God, then all discrimination between the elect and non-elect is removed, and the doctrine of predestination is altogether overturned: For if Christ may be said in any sense whatever to have died for all, what hinders us from declaring in the same sense that all men individually are elected by God?

Reply 8. These objections proceed from ignorance of the true reason of election or predestination. For it is not any kind of ordination to salvation, through whatever means, which places man in the number of the elect or predestinated, but an ordination through such means as God both knew and decreed would infallibly produce the effect of salvation in the elect person. Hence is that definition of predestination by Augustine (on Perseverance, cap. 14) *It is a foreknowledge and preparation of the benefits of God, by which those who are delivered are most certainly delivered.* Hence also that apostolical chain, Romans viii. 29, 30, in

which predestination is united in an inseparable bond with glorification, *Whom he did predestinate, them he also glorified.* Therefore, although we confess that the death of Christ was in some way ordained by God for a common remedy of the human race, and would benefit all under this Evangelical condition—if they should believe it, yet it does not follow hence that all men individually are promiscuously elected ; because God hath not determined to give to all men individually that grace whereby they may believe, and, by believing, may infallibly derive life from this death of Christ. And it may further be added, that although we should grant not only that Christ died for all men, but also that on account of this death of Christ sufficient grace was prepared and given by God to every individual (which we do not hold), yet no one from these concessions could rightly infer that all men are promiscuously elected, or that there is no difference between the elect and those who are passed by. The reason is evident ; Because there is no sufficient ordination of means to procure the salvation of man, were he predestinated, unless it should be added, that there is an infallible order of special providence appointing and directing the ordained means to a most certain attainment of the end, which nothing can prevent. This may be illustrated by the example of angels and men considered in a state of upright nature. All the angels individually when formed were furnished with sufficient grace, and thence sufficiently endowed to obtain blessedness. But this does not prove either that there was no election among the angels, or that they were all indiscriminately elected. Thus Adam himself, at his creation, and in him all his posterity, are understood to have been supplied with sufficient grace and duly furnished to obtain eternal life: but neither will it follow from thence that all men were elected, or that there was no predestination. For not every ordination to the obtaining of eternal life either at once makes a man elected, or denies that he is not elected, but only (as was before said) infallible ordination. That we may return therefore to our argument: From the death of Christ, ordained to be a propitiatory sacrifice for

all men individually, and applicable through faith for the obtaining of remission and salvation, it does not follow that election and preterition is taken away; because this common ordination which is revealed in the Gospel being granted, there is also a certain secret ordination, according to which the aforesaid death of Christ is decreed to be infallibly applied to some persons, to whom God will manifest his special compassion; it is not decreed to be so applied to others, upon whom God will not have compassion in the same manner. And this is abundantly sufficient to defend the doctrine of predestination and reprobation, although we extend the death of Christ to all men in the aforesaid sense.

OBJECTION 9. Some dispute, by means of an argument deduced, as they think, from similar circumstances, in this manner: It is as foreign from truth that Christ died according to the ordination of God, for some who are not saved, as that some are saved for whom, according to the ordination of God, he did not die: But this it would be absurd to assert: so likewise the former.

REPLY 9. I deny that the reasoning is similar on both sides. For (as it is a received maxim in Divinity) *Good arises only from pure sources, evil from any kind of defect:* The salvation of mankind therefore, which is the greatest good, is not produced without a full *concurrence* of all causes; but the loss of salvation, which is an evil, may happen from the defect of any one cause ordained for the salvation of mankind. Although it is impossible that any persons can be saved for whom Christ did not die, because the death of Christ is one of those ordained causes which operate to the salvation of mankind; yet it is not impossible to cut off some from salvation for whom he did die, because it was not appointed by God that the death of Christ alone, by the act of his oblation, should render God propitious to all, and should save all, but that it should *be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past,* (Romans iii. 25), and it is *unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference,* as it is said in the 22d verse.

But if any one should still urge, Why is the death of Christ declared to be given for a remedy to all men, but faith is not said to be given or prepared for all? I answer, Because the Scriptures clearly teach, that Christ by dying obtained for each and every man this grace, that, under the condition of faith, they might now hope for and obtain remission of sins and salvation: but this conditional grace could not be offered to all, nor could regard all in every way, unless this death of Christ should pertain to all men from the ordination of God himself. Now, on the other hand, we do not maintain that faith is destined for or given to all, because the same holy Scripture, which proposes the death of Christ as a benefit vouchsafed to all and applicable to every one through faith, does not make this faith a benefit promised or given to all, but derived from the peculiar decree of election. In addition to these things, the Mediator himself, who offered himself for a sacrifice to God to expiate the sins of the world, (Acts iii. 19 et seq.) obtained from God that all those individuals who should believe in him, should be absolved from their sins, and so far was willing to pay this ransom for all: but he did not apply to all the merit of his death, nor obtained from God that all should infallibly partake of faith and salvation. And here the secret of election discovers itself, which ought not to overturn or weaken the universality of the oblation, or the truth of the promise of the Gospel.

Objection 10. If the death of Christ were to be conceived by us as a remedy applicable to all men, then the holy Scriptures would not restrain the actual giving of the Son to those only who believe; but they apply to the faithful alone not only the benefit or real application, but also the very gift of the Son, John iii. 15, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* That which is given to mankind conditionally, is understood to be given to no one, if the condition be set aside. Since, therefore, this condition of believing is fulfilled by the elect alone, the consequence is, that we should say, that Christ was of-

fered for them alone. And therefore this oblation or death of Christ is not a remedy or ransom applicable, according to the ordination of God, to each and every man.

Reply 10. We may consider the giving or oblation of Christ in a twofold point of view. The first is that in which he is understood to have been given or offered to God the Father on the altar of the cross, to take away the sins of the world: of which the Apostle says, 1 Timothy ii. 5, 6, *There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all,* namely, to God the Father, as it is more clearly expressed Ephes. v. 2, *Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.* This oblation is the foundation of every future offering, by which he is offered to men in the Gospel, that, being apprehended by faith, he may bestow upon them eternal life through the merit of this sacrifice. Of this oblation the same Apostle speaks, Romans iii. 24, 25, We are *justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood,* &c. If we regard the former oblation, I deny that Christ offered himself a sacrifice, or gave himself a ransom to God the Father to expiate the sins of the world, under the condition of human faith, as it were in this form, *I offer myself to Thee as a sacrifice for the sins of the human race, provided they believe in me.* For he offered himself simply, not conditionally, to God the Father; which is proved from hence, that the Father, according to whose will the Son offered himself a sacrifice, did not determine with himself to give a Redeemer to the world under this hypothesis, If the world should believe; but God gave his Son to the world, and the Son gave himself to the Father a ransom to take away the sins of the world, gratuitously and absolutely. A condition indeed is annexed in the preaching of the Gospel, not to the giving, but to the eternal life which is to follow from the beneficial application of the thing given. Therefore, as to what regards the latter oblation, by which

Christ, who was offered up to God for men, is now offered to men in the Gospel, I deny also that this hypothetical and conditional oblation or giving of Christ, is even to be thought of from this preaching of the Gospel. For the Saviour in the place above-mentioned did not say, *So God loved the world, that he would give his Son for it if it should believe:* but after that he had declared that he was given absolutely to all from the love of God to man, he shews nevertheless that it would not profit all to eternal life absolutely and simply, but conditionally, even all if they should believe, or all who should believe. We also, if at any time we should preach the Gospel to unbelievers, as to the Indians or Americans, should not begin to inform them, *Christ the Son of God died for some of you who shall believe in him, and not for others,* but we should say, *Christ died to take away the sins of the whole world, and gave himself a ransom to God the Father, but in such a manner, that neither Christ who offered up himself as the price of redemption for all, nor God the Father to whom he was offered, wills that any of you should be delivered from their sins, before you believe in God and in Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.* To that, therefore, which is urged in the last place, *That what is understood to be given or promised under the condition of faith, is supposed not to be given or promised to any one, without the performance of this condition; and therefore Christ is truly affirmed to be given only for the elect, who perform the condition,* I answer, We no where read in the Scriptures, that Christ, or the death or sacrifice of Christ, was given or promised conditionally to the human race, although salvation or eternal life is every where promised to be given under the condition of faith. Wherefore it may also be added, That even a thing which is promised conditionally, has respect in some way to those who never fulfil the condition, namely, as to the right of claiming the promised benefit, if they should fulfil it; which Christ himself seems to imply, John iii. 18, where he teaches that unbelievers are condemned, *because they did not believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God.* Therefore even those who

believed not had the death of the Son of God applicable to themselves, although they had it not applied, because they believed not. And on this account the elect alone find life in the death of Christ, because they alone believe in God, who has compassion upon them.

Objection 11. The death of Christ is not applicable to those for whom he did not die, or was not offered up. But there are numberless persons for whom he did not die, or was not offered up, namely, all those who were not written in the book of life of the elect, before the foundation of the world. From thence they endeavour to confirm the minor, that the Apostle broadly asserts that God would freely give all things to those for whom the Son died, Romans viii. 32, *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* But he does not freely give all things to all men: Therefore Christ did not die for all: Therefore his death is not applicable to all.

Reply 11. I willingly grant that the death of Christ can in no true sense be said to be applicable to those for whom God did in no wise will that he should die. For the death of Christ is not a remedy applicable to expiate the sins of any one, except according to the ordination and acceptation of God. And for this reason, although the ransom paid by Christ to God the Father is in itself of sufficient and superabundant value to take away the sins, not only of men, but of fallen angels, yet, on account of the want of its ordination and acceptation as to angels, we deny that Christ ought to be said to have died for them in any way. The same thing might also be declared respecting men, if there were any alienated and excluded from all possibility of the aforesaid redemption on account of the same want of Divine ordination and acceptation. But as it was said, the major being granted, let us proceed to the minor. I answer therefore, That there is no one who is a partaker of the same human nature which the Redeemer deigned to assume, for whom Christ did not deliver up himself as a price of redemption, applicable according to

the ordination and acceptation of God, for remission of sins, to be obtained by faith in his blood. Nor does the Apostle contradict us, whose whole discourse in Romans viii. is not designed to console any description of persons in any condition, but the elect; nor the elect merely as such, but the elect now called, justified, sanctified, that is, as he says Coloss. i. 13, *now delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son.* Nor does he simply and universally affirm that God freely gives all things to all men for whom Christ died, but to all *of us* to whom the present discourse relates, that is, to all the predestinated who are believing in Christ, for whom not only Christ died, but to whom moreover Christ is now given in an especial manner, that is, is united and communicated with the infinite treasure of his merits. Therefore this consolatory argument of the Apostle derived from the death of Christ is efficacious; but only if it is accommodated to those persons to whom it was accommodated by the Apostle, and only so far as it was accommodated by him, namely, in this manner, *Thou, who from thy effectual calling, justification, and sanctification, canst now know and perceive that thou art predestinated, and that for thy special and effectual redemption, God willed not only that his Son should be offered up to himself, but also communicated to thee; why canst thou not trust him with the rest, that he will freely give thee all other things necessary to accomplish thy salvation?* But if any one desires to apply the aforesaid reasoning to any persons whatsoever setting aside the consideration of predestination, calling, and justification, in this manner, *Christ died for you, or Christ gave himself a ransom or sacrifice to God to expiate your sins, and therefore God will freely give you all things,* I say, that he extends this argument beyond its limits, contrary to the mind of the Apostle, who confined it to certain persons, namely, the predestinated, and to them as placed in a certain condition, namely, of justification and adoption.

Objection 12. Christ was ordained to be the Redeemer not from love to mankind in general, but from that special good will with which God embraced his own elect

peculiarly to eternal life: Therefore, the death of Christ is not a ransom applicable from the ordination of God to the redemption of all men, but is destined for the elect alone.

Reply 12. I deny the antecedent, and affirm that God in sending the Redeemer was willing to manifest to the world both these kinds of love; namely, that common love of the human race, which we call philanthropy, and that special and secret love, which we call good pleasure. The argument of common love is, that he would so far regard the human race, that is, all men individually, that they should have a Redeemer through whose satisfaction, apprehended by faith, they might obtain remission of sins. This love he did not exhibit to the fallen angels (whom, nevertheless, he preserves as his creatures), since Christ was in no wise ordained to be a Redeemer of them, nor is remission of sins through the satisfaction of a Redeemer either to be announced or applicable to them under any condition. From hence we clearly collect, that in the very appointment or ordination of a Redeemer, God had some regard of common love towards men, which he had not towards devils. Which will appear further if we rightly consider what this redemption is. It is, then, a payment of the just price due for us captives, not that we should be actually delivered on the payment of the price, but that we should be delivered as soon as we believe in the Redeemer. This is that ordination of the death of Christ, or of a satisfactory price, which flowed from the common love of God to all mankind, and therefore, it is rightly declared to be extended, under this condition, from us to all men individually. And to this we think that celebrated passage refers, John iii. 16, *God so loved the world*, &c. But now as to what relates to that secret and more special love, with which God embraces the elect, far be it from us to deny that the death and merit of Christ is a special gift to be effectually and infallibly applied in a special way to the elect, who are to be redeemed and saved through his special love. Therefore we attribute to that common love, with which God waits upon the human race, that he was

willing to appoint such a Redeemer, through whose death and satisfaction any one, provided he should believe in him, might be absolved from his sins, Acts xiii. 38. But we think that it is to be attributed to his special good pleasure, with which he embraces the elect alone, that from the death and merit of this appointed and ordained Redeemer, he should determine to give to certain individual persons effectually and infallibly, faith, remission of sins, and eternal life. And we think that the Saviour referred to this special intention, John x. 15, where he says, *that he laid down his life for his sheep,* that is, that he so offered himself up as a sacrifice for the elect, that through his death not only they might be saved, if they should believe, but that they might actually believe and be saved. We ought not, therefore, so to urge the special good pleasure of God towards the elect, that we should deny that the ransom of Christ was ordained by God to reconcile and deliver all mankind individually, and to be applied, provided they embrace it with a true faith; leaving at the same time to God his own secret judgments, and full liberty in dispensing or not dispensing that special grace, by means of which faith is infallibly produced in the hearts of men, and an effectual application is secured, and eternal life is infallibly obtained according to the covenant of the Gospel.

Objection 13. If the death of Christ is, according to the ordination of God, applicable to all men for salvation, then the salvation of all would be effected by this death of Christ. For God always effects and follows up that end which he designs. If, therefore, he had ordained the death of Christ to procure the salvation of the human race, he would also have saved the whole human race by means of this death of Christ. Those, therefore, who assert that the death of Christ is, through the ordination of God himself, appointed to be a remedy applicable to all men for salvation, seem to impugn the wisdom of God. For he has very little wisdom who designs a thing which he does not accomplish. They seem also to impugn the omnipotence of God. For it is the act of a weak person to or-

dain a benefit or remedy applicable to every individual, which, nevertheless, on account of the wickedness or unbelief of men, he cannot apply to many of them.

Reply 13. In order to remove these scruples it should be attentively noticed, that we defend this proposition only, That there is some kind of ordination or good pleasure of the Divine will, according to which the death of Christ is a satisfactory ransom in such a manner applicable for all men to the obtaining of remission, that if they should submit themselves to this ordination and good pleasure, it would be actually applied to each and every man. But we do not assert or maintain the proposition, That there is any ordination, good pleasure, or decree of the Divine will, according to which he should absolutely intend or appoint to make this death of Christ to be effectually and infallibly applied to each and every man. The former ordination considered in itself is sufficient for the purpose, that the death of Christ may be truly said to be applicable to all men individually; since the want of such an ordination is the reason why we cannot say that Christ died for the apostate angels, or that the death of Christ is not applicable to them in any degree. These things being premised, I affirm that the consequence of the major is invalid. For although the death of Christ, according to the ordination and will of God himself, is a remedy of such a kind that it may be applied to any individual of the human race for salvation, and the mode of its application is clearly laid down in the holy Scripture, namely, through the performance of the condition of faith; yet it cannot be inferred from thence, either that faith or salvation is infallibly to be conferred on all and each one; because it is a very different thing to ordain the death of Christ as a remedy applicable for salvation to all men, and to prescribe faith as the mode or condition by which it is applied; and to appoint and absolutely to decree effectually to produce faith and salvation in certain persons. This latter, therefore, cannot be rightly deduced from the former. For as if God should create any herb endued with such a virtue that it might heal any one who labours under any disease

whatever, and moreover should promise, that any one who should use it should undoubtedly recover his former health, any one would rightly conclude from thence, that this herb was a remedy for any disease, applicable, by the ordination of God, to all sick persons individually; but would not rightly infer that every individual would be infallibly cured by means of this remedy, because it would not be given to some that they should find this remedy, and others perhaps would not be willing to make use of it when it was found: So, because God sent the Redeemer into the world, and furnished him with so much virtue and grace that he might confer remission of sins and eternal life upon any man who labours under damnable guilt, and moreover promised in the Gospel, that any one who should believe in this Redeemer should be absolved from all his sins, any one may rightly conclude from this, that this Redeemer and his death are applicable to all sinners; but not rightly, that all sinners will be saved by his death, because to many this saving death of the Redeemer is not revealed, to many it is not given that they should believe in him, although he is made known to them. But that which is brought forward on the opposite side, *That God always accomplishes the end which he designs*, admits of an easy solution. For we do not contend that God by his absolute will (which not only predetermines the ordination of means to an end, but also the infallible production of the end) intended actually to procure the salvation of each and every man through the death of Christ; but that he appointed, willed, and ordained that the death of his Son should be, and should be esteemed, a ransom of such a kind that it might be offered and applied to all men individually. And this God evidently accomplished. For all acknowledge, or ought to acknowledge, that Christ so suffered, and died, and was offered up for the sins of all men, that all together, without exception, might, through his death, by believing, obtain remission of sins and salvation. Nor is it contrary to the Divine wisdom to appoint and sometimes to confer upon men means ordained and applicable to a certain end, and at the same time to permit many men to fail of attain-

ing that end. For by this means God attains a higher end, even the illustration of his glory, by the demonstration of his justice towards those who abuse the means ordained to procure the salvation of mankind, and by the demonstration of his mercy towards those who, by the benefit of his special grace, use the aforesaid means to their salvation; and, lastly, by the demonstration of his supreme dominion, and free liberty towards those to whom he did not think fit even to reveal the means, which were supplied by himself for the salvation of mankind, and which were applicable by his own ordination to any persons whatever. Respecting the omnipotence of God also we reply, That it is not weakened in any degree by the admission of our opinion. For we do not say, that through the wickedness of some men God cannot apply the death of Christ for salvation to all, which he appointed and ordained to be applicable to all; but that God *who hath mercy upon whom he will, and whom he will he leaves hardened,* would not heal this wickedness in all men by the remedy of special grace, would not make the death of Christ to be applied to all, which he made applicable to all. And here, of him who is delivered through the death of Christ, which is applied to him by the assistance of special grace, God would rightly say, *Thus I will:* Of him who, notwithstanding this applicable remedy, is condemned, no application having been made, he would also say, *Take that thine is and go thy way; I will give to this man what is not due to him, I will not give it to thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?* Here if any one should murmur, he would deservedly hear, *O man, who art thou that repliest against God?*

Objection 14. If we assert that Christ died for all, it will follow, First, That Christ had loved all men with the highest and greatest love. John xv. 13, *Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.* And 1 John iii. 16, *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.* Which does not appear, because he does not lead all to life by this his death. Secondly, it would also follow, that Christ equally loved Peter and Judas, the elect and the non-elect. For he ex-

hibited to all an infallible proof of the highest love; but there are no different degrees in that which is the highest. Lastly, if Christ so died for all that by his death he procured for those who were not elected only the possibility of salvation under the condition of faith, or a remedy only applicable, which he knew would not be applied, but for the elect the application itself and salvation; he may seem to have loved those more who were not elected than the elect, because it shews greater love to suffer death for any one in order to acquire for him a small than a great good; as he would shew a more ardent love for any one who should expose himself to death lest another should be hurt only a very little, than if he should do it lest he should be capitally punished.

Reply 14. The object of both these passages of Scripture is the same; namely, to kindle in Christians a mutual and most tender love from the example of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who so far loved us as to endure death for us. But the sense of the words is this. To endure death or to give up life for another, is the greatest external effect and most evident proof of love; which, since Christ exhibited it towards us by laying down his life for us, we ought also, where there is need, to lay down our lives for the brethren, as it is in the aforesaid place, 1 John iii. 16. Therefore, it is not enough that we should be ready to expend gold and silver, to undergo difficult labours or dangers for the brethren, because there is a much greater love, that is, a greater, more certain, and clearer proof of our love, namely, that we should lay down our life for them. And because there is nothing dearer to any one than himself, therefore there is no greater testimony of love than this, that any one should give himself up for his friend. Now I come nearer to the solution and say, Although we confess that no one has greater love, that is, can manifest on his own part a greater external effect of his love, than in laying down his life, because no one has any thing more precious than his life; yet, we deny that it can be rightly deduced from hence, that the love of a person in dying for some others, is absolutely, simply, and in every

respect as to them all, the highest and greatest that any one can conceive. For, in the first place, when one person lays down his life for many, nothing hinders that he might not possibly love one more vehemently than another as to the internal act: as if we should suppose that Jacob had suffered death to deliver all his sons from captivity, yet we should assert rightly that he did not love them all in the highest degree, but he loved Joseph and Benjamin more than the others. Therefore, the highest love as to intenseness cannot be inferred in respect of all to whom this greatest proof of love is exhibited. Secondly, Any one may give up his life for many promiscuously, and yet as to the greatness of the good willed, love some much more than others, and therefore not embrace all either with the highest or with equal love. For the greatness of love is not to be esteemed only by the precious thing which is given to the person loved by the lover, but by the benefits which are intended to be conferred upon the person loved by that gift. For example, if a king's son should suffer death for all who were guilty of treason, on this condition, that all should be absolved who were willing to humble themselves as suppliants before the king's throne, and faithfully promise obedience for the future; but he should design to obtain this in addition from his father for some of them, that on account of the merit of his death he would deign to persuade them to this submission and obedience, and having thus persuaded them, would not only absolve them, but also advance them to the highest honours: who does not perceive that death would have been endured for all, and yet that all were not loved in the highest and greatest degree? For since *to love* is to wish good things to any one, and to confer them, it follows that in a common benefit being granted to many, those are more loved to whom greater good things are designed and conferred from the aforesaid benefit. *Lastly*, Although men cannot exhibit to men a greater external testimony of love than that one should die for another, yet God the Father, Christ the Mediator, the God-man, and the Holy Spirit can exhibit a greater secret act and effect of their own love to-

wards some of those for whom Christ died than towards others ; as if they should determine to give to some not only remission of sins and eternal life through the merit of the death of Christ, provided they should believe in this their Redeemer ; but also should choose some from eternity unto life effectually to participate in Christ the Redeemer, and should prepare for them and infallibly give all those things which should effect this infallible participation and application. From these things it appears that that inference is not tenable, *Christ died for all ; Therefore, he loved all with the highest and with equal love;* because, this common benefit of his death being granted to all, yet he may love some more intensely than others, and decree, prepare, and give to some more and greater benefits from the merit of his death than to others. Which is evident in the elect themselves, for they all confess that Christ suffered for all of them, and yet no one would affirm that Christ embraced with equal love every one (if I may so speak) of the multitude of the elect, as he did the patriarchs, apostles, or his own most blessed mother, or enriches every one with equal gifts of grace and glory redounding from the merit of his death. But the other argument, in which it is inferred, *If Christ suffered death for all, he would shew greater love to the non-elect than to the elect, because it argues greater love to endure death for any one to procure for him some little good than a great one*, seems to me little agreeable to right reason. If different kinds of death were to be suffered for different persons, this objection might have some appearance of truth ; but where one death is endured for all, there it is evident that he is more loved to whom he who dies intends more and greater benefits from this one death. For if *to love* is to wish good things to another, then to wish greater benefits is to love more. But in this manner the love of the dying Christ manifested itself towards the elect, and those who were not elected ; for from one and the same death he willed that more and greater benefits should arise to the former than to the latter.

Objection 15. Means wisely destined do not exceed their adequate end. But the adequate end of the death of Christ is the salvation of the elect. Therefore the death of Christ has no ordination to any persons whatever who are not elected. Therefore it is falsely stated to be applicable to all men by the ordination of God.

Reply 15. I acknowledge that the infallible salvation of the elect is, in subserviency to the glory of God, a certain special and most excellent end, for the obtaining of which the death of Christ was destined; but I deny that it was the only or sole end. For God sent his Son into the world, and willed that he should die, not only that he might effectually save the elect, but also that remission of sins and eternal life might be brought to and also conferred upon mankind generally in the Gospel, if they should believe. But it is not understood that this general or conditional covenant is confirmed, unless the death of Christ is presupposed to be applicable to all men according to the ordination of God, and actually to be applied to any one as soon as he should have believed. This end the Scripture hath clearly indicated in many places; in John iii. 14, 15, *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* And John vi. 40, *This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life.* And Acts x. 43, *To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.* I omit other passages. From these it will sufficiently appear, that although not all, but only the elect believe, God specially softening their hearts, yet that the death of Christ was so offered to God the Father by the Son, and is so indiscriminately offered by God the Father to mankind, and is so announced promiscuously to all by the ministers of the Gospel, that any one may collect from thence that there is a kind of firm and stedfast ordination of God, according to which the death of Christ may pertain to all men. This ordination the non-elect render use-

less to themselves by their own unbelief; but they do not cause such an ordination to be made void, or that it should not be acknowledged to have been established by the death of Christ to these unbelievers. For if we admit this, any unbeliever may pretend, *Although I should believe the Gospel, I should not be delivered from my sins by the death of Christ, because the death of Christ had no ordination according to which I could be a partaker of it.* Which, on the other hand, is opposed by the words of Christ himself, John iii. 17, 18, *God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.* And this is what Prosper says (Ad Obj. Vinc.), *The death of Christ has indeed in itself what may benefit all men, but if it is not received it will not heal.* That which has in itself that it may profit all men, has it from the general ordination of God; but that it is not received by many through faith, this happens from the common unbelief of mankind; that it is received by some proceeds from the special compassion of God.

Objection 16. It is absurd to declare that the death of Christ is a ransom applicable by the ordination of God to those to whom it is not applied, because in the very death of Christ there was the most sure application of death for all those for whom it is truly affirmed that he died and suffered: Therefore, the death of Christ is not a remedy ordained by God, except for certain individual persons elected and known to God only, to whom at length it becomes saving as to the event.

Reply 16. We deny that there is any thing absurd in the aforesaid sentiment, which we have demonstrated to be true, and agreeable to Divine wisdom. But that which is objected, *As to all for whom Christ died, in the death of Christ himself is included also the infallible application of his death,* that does not seem to us to be conceded. For the oblation of Christ considered merely in itself, altogether obtains from God, that every individual who is willing to

believe in Christ shall be saved. This efficacy of the death of Christ the Gospel proclaims and promises to all the world; but that infallible purpose of applying this death to certain persons, the ministers of the Gospel cannot promise to any mortal by name. We say, therefore, that the death of Christ was ordained for all those to whom remission of sins may be announced through faith in his blood, which grace regards every partaker of human nature. But we confess that the death of Christ is infallibly to be applied to the elect alone, because the certainty of the application depends, as to the primary cause, on the secret and eternal act of God in predestinating, and not only on the act of Christ in offering up himself for men. Christ, therefore, in offering up himself had a general intention conformed to the ordination of the Father, namely, that he might deliver any persons whatsoever indiscriminately from the guilt of their sins, provided they should believe in him, and in this sense he is said to have offered up himself for all. He had also, as conscious of the Divine predestination, a special intention conformed to the secret and eternal good pleasure of the Father, namely, that he might obtain through the merit of his death for his sheep, who were given to him according to the decree of election, and might give them faith, salvation, and all things. And with this special intention it is said, that he laid down his life for his own peculiar people, that is, for certain individual persons. That which comes to certain persons from the death of Christ, by the special act of Divine predestination, ought not to overthrow that which is acquired by all through the very act of the oblation. The infallible application to one person rather than to another may be ascribed to predestination, but that which may be applicable to every individual through faith, may be assigned, from the tenor of the Divine covenant, to the oblation of Christ itself.

Objection 17. The last objection is derived from those passages in which the death of Christ is expressly referred to certain persons; from which they infer, that they have no regard to others. The passages which are

relied on are these, Matt. i. 21, *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.* John x. 15, *I lay down my life for my sheep.* John xi. 5, Jesus died, *that he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad;* and such like.

Reply 17. From the aforesaid testimonies, and others which are similar, it is well concluded that the death of Christ, according to the will of God in sending his Son, and of the Son in offering himself, pertains in a special manner to the peculiar people who are known only to God, that is, to the elect. But that special mode is of this kind, that he cannot be said to have died for these alone, but he died for these only with the certain, eternal, gratuitous purpose of infallibly saving them, through the free gift of his special mercy flowing from some special providence, which we call predestination. But from testimonies of this kind, which refer to certain persons, the death of Christ, not considered simply, but complicated with the decree of secret predestination, it is wrongly inferred, that this death does not pertain to all men in some general way. But the general mode is of this kind, that we should acknowledge that Christ died for the whole human race, with an evangelical covenant, and that a most sure one, concerning expiating sins and conferring eternal life on each and every man, provided they should embrace this Redeemer of the world with a true faith. And hence it is, that although some passages occur in the holy Scriptures, in which Christ is said to have died for the elect, or for his own peculiar people, yet none occur in which it is denied that he died for any persons, many occur in which it is asserted that he died for all. For the Spirit of God was willing to shew to those that believed in the death of Christ the special privilege of the elect, but he was unwilling to overwhelm in silence the common privilege of the human race in the same death of Christ. It is our part, therefore, to leave to God the decree of his secret predestination, according to which he determined how far, and to whom, he will effectually apply this death of Christ by the gift of his special grace; and in the mean time, to

acknowledge with grateful minds the sum of his revealed Gospel, which promulgates *That one died for all, that whosoever should believe in him may have eternal life.* On this subject Ambrose says (In Luc. lib. vi. cap. 7), *Although Christ suffered for all, yet he suffered especially for us, because he suffered for his Church.* And so far we have laid before you our first proposition, explained, confirmed, and vindicated from objections to the contrary. We have been the longer in treating of it, because (as it was observed) it contains the chief part of the matter, and opens the way to resolve the rest, in the discussion of which we shall be much shorter. Let us, therefore, proceed to the second proposition.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND PROPOSITION STATED, EXPLAINED, AND CONFIRMED.

IN our first proposition we endeavoured to shew that the death or merit of Christ was appointed by God, proposed in the holy Scriptures, and to be considered by us, as an universal remedy applicable to all men for salvation from the ordination of God. And on this account we hesitate not to assert that Christ died for all men, inasmuch as he endured death, by the merit and virtue of which all men individually who obey the Gospel may be delivered from death and obtain eternal salvation. But because some persons in such a way concede that Christ died for all men, that with the same breath they assert that he died for the elect alone, and so expound that received distinction of Divines, *That he died for all sufficiently, but for the elect effectually*, that they entirely extinguish the first part of the sentence; we will lay down a second proposition, which will afford an occasion of discussing that subject expressly, which we have hitherto only glanced at slightly by the way. This second proposition, therefore, shall be reduced into this form; if it is rather prolix, pardon it. *The death of Christ is the universal cause of the salvation of mankind, and Christ himself is acknowledged to have died for all men sufficiently, not by reason of the mere sufficiency or of the intrinsic value, according to which the death of God is a price more than sufficient for redeeming a thousand worlds; but by reason of the Evangelical covenant confirmed with the whole human race through the merit of this death, and of the Divine ordination depending upon it, according to which, under the possible condition of faith, remission of sins and eternal life is decreed to be set before every mortal man who will be-*

lieve it, on account of the merits of Christ. In handling this proposition we shall do two things. First, we shall explain some of the terms. Secondly, we shall divide our proposition into certain parts, and establish them separately by some arguments.

In the first place, therefore, is to be explained, what we mean by *mere sufficiency*, and what by that which is commonly admitted by Divines, *That Christ died for all sufficiently*. If we speak of the price of redemption, that ransom is to be acknowledged sufficient which exactly answers to the debt of the captive; or which satisfies the demand of him who has the power of liberating the captive. The equality of one thing to another, or to the demands of him who has power over the captive, constitutes what we call this *mere sufficiency*. This shall be illustrated by examples. Suppose my brother was detained in prison for a debt of a thousand pounds. If I have in my possession so many pounds, I can truly affirm that this money is sufficient to pay the debt of my brother, and to free him from it. But while it is not offered for him, the mere sufficiency of the thing is understood, and estimated only from the value of it, the act of offering that ransom being wanting, without which the aforesaid sufficiency effects nothing. For the same reason, if many persons should be capitally condemned for the crime of high treason, and the king himself against whom this crime was committed should agree that he would be reconciled to all for whom his son should think fit to suffer death: Now the death of the Son, according to the agreement, is appointed to be a sufficient ransom for redeeming all those for whom it should be offered. But if there should be any for whom that ransom should not be offered, as to those it has only a mere sufficiency, which is supposed from the value of the thing considered in itself, and not that which is understood from the act of offering. To these things I add, If we admit the aforesaid ransom not only to be sufficient from the equality of one thing to the other, and from his demand, who requires nothing more for the redemption of the captives; but also to be greater and better in an infinite de-

gree, and to exceed all their debts, yet if there should not be added to this the intention and act of offering for certain captives, although such a ransom should be ever so copious and superabundant, considered in itself and from its intrinsic value, yet what was said of the sufficiency may be said of the superabundance, that there was a mere superabundance of the thing, but that it effected nothing as yet for the liberation of the persons aforesaid. Now to this mere sufficiency, which regards nothing else than the equal or superabundant worth of the appointed price of redemption, I oppose another, which, for the sake of perspicuity, I shall call *ordained sufficiency*. This is understood when the thing which has respect to the ransom, or redemption price, is not only equivalent to, or superior in value to the thing redeemed, but also is ordained for its redemption by some wish to offer or actual offering. Thus a thousand talents laid up in the treasury of a prince are said to be a sufficient ransom to redeem ten citizens taken captive by an enemy; but if there is not an intention to offer, and an actual offering and giving these talents for those captives, or for some of them, then a mere and not an ordained sufficiency of the thing is supposed as to those persons for whom it is not given. But if you add the act and intention offering them for the liberation of certain persons, then the ordained sufficiency is asserted as to them alone. Further, this ordained sufficiency of the ransom for the redemption of a captive may be twofold: Absolute; when there is such an agreement between him who gives and him who receives this price of redemption for the liberation of the captives, that as soon as the price is paid, on the act of payment the captives are immediately delivered. Conditional; when the price is accepted, not that it may be paid immediately, and the captive be restored to liberty; but that he should be delivered under a condition if he should first do something or other. *When we say that Christ died sufficiently for all, we do not understand the mere sufficiency of the thing with a defect of the oblation as to the greater part of mankind, but that ordained sufficiency, which has the intent and act of offering joined to it,*

and that for all; but with the conditional, and not the absolute ordination which we have expressed. In one word, when we affirm that Christ died for all sufficiently, we mean, That there was in the sacrifice itself a sufficiency or equivalency, yea, a superabundance of price or dignity, if it should be compared to the whole human race; that both in the offering and the accepting there was a kind of ordination, according to which the aforesaid sacrifice was offered and accepted for the redemption of all mankind. This may suffice for the explanation of the first term.

Secondly; That is also to be explained, which is stated in the proposition; namely, *That through the merit of the death of Christ, a new covenant was entered into between God and the human race.* By this covenant we understand that which is urged by the Apostle, Gal. iii. *Believe, and thou shalt live,* and is opposed to the legal command, *Do this and thou shalt live.* This agreement, which promises salvation to every sinner under the condition of faith, has no foundation or confirmation any where else than in the blood of the Mediator; without the effusion of which no mortal man could aspire to eternal life, not even though believing. *But through the death of Christ having been accepted by God as a ransom, now it is lawful for any man indiscriminately to ascend into heaven by believing,* as the Apostle shews in Romans iii. 21 to 26; and Christ himself, Mark xvi. 15, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.* Therefore in this evangelical covenant, confirmed by the death of Christ, which the Apostles published to the whole world, and the ministers of the Gospel preach at the present time, there is no difference of persons made. As well Esau shall be saved, if he should believe in the Messiah, as Jacob shall be condemned if he should not believe. But it is to be confessed, that there is also another ordination of God, secret and absolute, regarding certain definite persons, and founded likewise on the death of Christ, which obtains the name of the *new covenant.* But this is understood rather as agreed upon between God the Father and Christ, than between God and us. For it is that which is related by the Pro-

phet Isaiah (liii. 10), *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed;* and is explained by the Apostle, Heb. viii. 10, *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people,* &c. As if he should say, That Christ by his death not only established that conditional covenant which may be published to all men individually in this form, *If thou shalt believe, whosoever thou art, thou shalt be saved through the death of Christ,* but also that secret and absolute covenant concerning the giving of faith to certain persons and infallibly saving them through Christ and for his sake. But it is to be observed, That this latter covenant is known to Christ alone, nor can it be opened to any one by the ministers of Christ, as to the individual persons whom it embraces. For the Apostles themselves could, and we can preach to every man that conditional and revealed covenant, *If thou shalt believe, thou shalt be saved.* But neither could they, nor can we promise infallibly to any one, *Thou art one of those whom God gave to Christ the Mediator, and to whom, through Christ and for his sake, he will give persevering faith, and will infallibly lead to eternal life.* For this would be the same as if we should declare that we were in the councils of God before the foundations of the world were laid, and could point out with our finger the elect and the non-elect. Without this latter covenant, which is more properly understood to be established between God and men, that first conditional covenant would be in vain to all men through human depravity, and the precious and infinitely meritorious blood of Christ would flow in vain. But since, as it was said, God alone knows them to whom this covenant has regard, it is our business to urge and press that first conditional covenant, which is revealed to us; and this is that which we contend was confirmed by the death of Christ with the whole human race. Lastly, it is to be observed, although that conditional covenant is not actually made known to all men, yet it is of such a kind, that it may be divulged

and announced to every mortal; although every one will not claim for themselves their right in this covenant, yet there is no one to whom it is not lawful, through the merit of the death of Christ, to promise this to himself and to claim it according to the covenant, *If I believe, I shall be saved.* It is established, as to all men individually, but through some special kind of providence of God overruling it, it is revealed and made known to some and not to others.

It remains, in the third place, that we should explain what was laid down in the proposition, respecting *the Divine ordination depending on the aforesaid covenant, according to which, remission of sins and eternal life is decreed to be exhibited to every man, under the possible condition of faith.* And here that only needs explanation which we affirm, *that the condition of faith is possible to every one.* We would not then that this should be so understood as if every one had in himself an internal and proportionate natural principle for eliciting the act of true and living faith. For this was the error of Faustus, of Rhegium, and the Semipelagians, who ascribe faith to free-will, and dream that the gift of faith is as it were naturally inborn and inherent in them. To this those words of Faustus have respect (lib. 2. De lib. arbitr. cap. 6), *You see that the benefit of believing is not a new privilege, but an old one; and that, at the very beginning of the world, as the mind of man was endowed by its excellent Author with understanding and reason, so also was it with faith.* And lest any should think that this gift of faith was lost in fallen man, he adds a little afterwards (cap. 7), *That every follower of virtue should cultivate in himself this general gift of faith with special diligence.* See more on this opinion in the work itself. Although, therefore, he calls faith a gift, yet he intimates that it is a natural and general gift, as though it were possible to elicit this act of believing by the power of free-will. But from this we are altogether averse, nor have we regard to this in saying that the condition of faith is *possible.* Moreover, neither do we found this possibility of believing in any supernatural gift received by all. For we dare not maintain,

that gratuitous assistance sufficient to produce the act of believing is given to all, since the Scripture itself teaches, in a manner sufficiently clear, that faith is the special gift of God. This, therefore, is disallowed, since, with the most learned Bannesius (in Quest. 23, Ars. 3 Concl. 8) we found the possibility of performing this condition neither on any natural and innate gift, nor on a supernatural gift received by all; but in a supernatural gift to be received possibly by any living person, according to ordinary law, as the Schoolmen observe. These things being thus expounded and determined, I will now divide the aforesaid proposition into three parts, which I will confirm separately by the reasons to be alleged.

First. *The mere sufficiency of the death of Christ, which is estimated only by the intrinsic value of this ransom, without that ordained sufficiency which arises from the intention and act of offering, is not so far available that Christ may be truly said to have died for all men sufficiently.* I have thought that this proposition should be laid down for the sake of those who strenuously maintain that Christ died for the elect alone, and yet (which I confess I am too dull to understand) admit that Christ died for all sufficiently, and sometimes greatly exaggerate this sufficiency as extending itself to all mankind. They profess, indeed, *that Christ died for all men, for all orders, states, and kinds of men, yea also for individual persons as to the sufficiency of his merits.* (Contra rem. Collat. p. 104, & Status Controv. p. 144.) The Veteranici, in their judgment exhibited to the Synod of Dort, write thus (Acta Synod. Dordr. p. 99) *When Christ is said to have died for all, this may be understood of the sufficiency of his merit, or the greatness of the price. Since the death of the Son of God is the only perfect and sufficient ransom for expiating and blotting out all the sins of the whole world: the immense merit of righteousness, the universal medicine of death, the eternal fountain of life,* &c. A little after, *This sufficiency of the ransom as to the reprobate, has a double end, one in itself, the other accidentally. The end in itself is, that God testifies that he delights not in the perdition of the wicked, since he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in*

him should not perish, but have everlasting life. The accidental end is, that by this sufficiency of the ransom they might be rendered inexcusable. For these perish, not through the fault of Christ, but of themselves, when, through their own unbelief, they refuse the benefits of Christ offered in the Gospel. So far their opinion. I deny that this sufficiency of the death of Christ for reconciling all men can be rightly conceived from the mere sufficiency of the thing offered, unless there be added the ordained sufficiency from the act of offering. Which may be proved thus:

ARGUMENT 1st. When we say that Christ died sufficiently for all men, we say nothing else than that he was offered up sufficiently for all men, or that he gave himself as a ransom or price of redemption sufficiently for all men. But *to die for all, or to be offered up for all, or to give himself for all,* designates the act of dying, or of offering up himself to deliver all, completed by some ordination. Therefore, the sufficiency of the ransom alone, without the intention and act of offering accomplished as to the persons, cannot make this assertion true. *Christ died sufficiently for all.* But common sense refuses that it should be granted that he died sufficiently for all, who is denied to have died or to have been offered up for some. But granting the intrinsic sufficiency of the ransom to redeem a thousand worlds, at the same time it must be granted that this same ransom is not yet offered in any way for many men, nor yet offered up sufficiently. For as ten thousand pounds are enough, and more than sufficient to liberate five debtors, who each owe two hundred pounds; yet if this entire sum should be offered and paid to the creditor for two only by name, the other three being excluded, the sufficiency and superabundance of this ransom in itself will not effect, that it may be said to be given and paid sufficiently for those three: thus, in this common cause of the human race, although the precious blood of Christ be a ransom more than sufficient for blotting out the debts of every individual, yet it cannot be from thence inferred that he was sufficiently offered for them, who, in the very act of offering, are openly excluded. Therefore,

they do not seem to interpret so much as to ridicule this generally received and most true decision of Divines, *That Christ died for all men sufficiently*, who transfer the term *sufficiently* from the intention and act of dying to the mere sufficiency or intrinsic value of the death considered in itself; as if the sense were, *The death of Christ hath in itself sufficient merit and value to blot out the sins of all men, but Christ was not offered nor died for all;* since the evident sense of this saying is, *That Christ died for all sufficiently, although what he offered for all sufficiently, he will not apply to all effectually, on account of the intervening obstacle of unbelief.*

Argument 2. In this distinction of the Schoolmen, which our people commonly admit, viz. *That Christ died for all sufficiently, but for the predestinated effectually*, the words *sufficiently* and *effectually* denote that which was common to all men, whether elect or non-elect, in the mode of the oblation, and that which was peculiar to the elect alone. It was common to both, that Christ died or was offered as a sacrifice to God the Father sufficiently for them. But how can this first term *sufficiently* be referred promiscuously to the elect and the non-elect, if it marks out a mere sufficiency of the thing, excluding the ordination of the same thing to individuals, which arises from the intention and act of offering? Or, what need is there of that other term *effectually*, to make a distinction in the mode of the oblation, or in the intention of offering, as to the elect and non-elect, if Christ had no intention at all of offering himself up except for the predestinated alone? This twofold distinction is evidently frivolous and vain, where in things distinguished from each other, both parts are not presupposed. It is therefore to be observed, that the holy Fathers, when urging the universal sufficiency of the death of Christ, do not stop at the mere sufficiency of the thing, but at the act, intention, and mode of offering. In this manner Athanasius* always speaks in his treatise

* Athanasius, a celebrated Christian Bishop of the fourth Century. He was a native of Egypt, and a deacon of the Church of Alexandria under

On the incarnation of the Word. I will mention one or two passages; *Christ the Son of God, having assumed a body like to ours, because we were all exposed to death, gave himself up to death for us all as a sacrifice to his Father* (p. 42.) Again, (p. 48) *After he had given proofs of his Divinity, it now remained that he should offer up a sacrifice for all, delivering the temple of his body to death for all, that he might set all free from original sin,* &c. Observe, that the mark of universality is united, not with the intrinsic sufficiency of the thing offered, but with the intention and act of offering, which referred to all men. Thus Augustine (vol. 9. p. 467. Tract. 92 on John), *The blood of Christ was shed for the remission of all sins in such a manner, that it can blot out the sin itself for which it was shed.* He does not say, that there was a sufficient intrinsical value in the blood which was shed to expiate the sins of all mankind, which is allowed by all who know how to value aright the blood of God, but he urges the manner and act of offering, and in that respect points out its universality. *Thus it was shed for the remission of all sins.* It is one thing to say that the blood of Christ has of itself and in itself a sufficient value to blot out the sins of all men, and another to affirm that it was actually shed for the remission of all sins, as Augustine says. But why do I mention the holy Fathers? The sacred Scriptures speak of the death of Christ so as to refer its universal efficacy not to the mere dignity of the

Alexander, the Bishop whom he succeeded in the dignity A.D. 326. He acquired the surname of Great on account of his zeal for the orthodox faith, in opposition to all heresies, especially the Arians, from whom he suffered the bitterest persecutions during the whole course of his episcopacy of 46 years. His works, which are numerous, contain a defence of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation; of all which the best Edition is that of the Benedictines, 3 Vols. folio, Paris, 1698. The Creed which goes by his name, though supposed not to have proceeded immediately from his pen, contains the best illustration of his sentiments. Before it is hastily rejected by any one, it would be well to peruse with attention the remarks upon it in Shepherd's valuable work—"Critical and Practical Elucidation of the Morning and Evening Prayer of the Church of England." It may be remarked of modern sources of information, that Gorton's Biographical Dictionary has an extended Life of Athanasius, well drawn up, and Clarke's "Succession of Sacred Literature" contains a good account of his works.

sacrifice offered, but to the act and intention of the offering. 1 Tim. ii. 6, *Who gave himself a ransom for all.* The Apostle does not say, This ransom in itself, and in its own intrinsic value, is sufficient for the redemption of all, but in reality was given for a few, not for all; but, he *gave himself for all.* Therefore, the intention and act of Christ in giving himself includes all mankind, in like manner as that of the Father in sending his Son; *God so loved the world,* &c. (John iii. 16.) Therefore, the mere sufficiency of the thing cannot so far avail, that Christ should be affirmed to have died sufficiently for all, without an ordained sufficiency to all from the intention and act of his offering.

ARGUMENT 3. Christ is acknowledged to have died sufficiently for all men, in that sense in which it is denied that he died for the fallen angels. This is plain, and admitted by all the orthodox, who often mention this difference between the evil angels and some bad men, at least while they are living in this world. The words of Ambrose on Ps. cxviii. refer to this, *The earth is full of the mercy of the Lord* (Serm. 8. p. 658), *That mystical Sun of righteousness rose for all, came to all, Christ suffered for all, rose again for all. But if any one does not believe in Christ, he deprives himself of that general benefit.* A little afterwards, *Perhaps you will say, Why is it not said,* that heaven is full of the mercy of the Lord? *Because there are spiritual wickednesses in heavenly places, but the common benefit of Divine pardon and the remission of sins does not pertain to them.* From which things it appears, That Christ so suffered for the whole human race, that all men have from thence a common right of obtaining pardon through faith, which the demons have not, because he did not in any way die for them. One of our own countrymen, who contends strenuously for limiting the death of Christ, yet willingly grants this, (Ames, apud Grevinch. p. 55) *The sufficiency of the death does not refer in the same way to mankind as to devils. He paid a sufficient ransom for all men, if they would only embrace it, but not for devils.* This difference in the payment

of this ransom is worthy of observation. It was so paid to God that it could not redeem devils, even if they might be supposed to believe; because it was not paid for them; but it was so exhibited and given by God, that it might redeem any of the human race, if they would believe; whence could this be, unless it was offered and paid for them? For it could not avail for the deliverance of any persons whatsoever, even if they should believe, unless it were supposed to be given and offered by God for them in a general view of the human race, even when they did not believe. Having, therefore, established this distinction between the sufficiency of the death of Christ as to men and as to devils, namely, that the death of Christ is understood to be sufficient for all men in the same sense as it is rightly denied to be sufficient for the fallen angels, let us pass from this major proposition to the minor. I say, then, if we do not acknowledge any other sufficiency in the death of Christ as to the redemption of all mankind, except that which we have called *mere sufficiency*, and which has respect to the intrinsic value of the ransom, the ordination of the offering as to individuals being disregarded—there is no distinction made between such persons and the devils themselves as to the right of obtaining pardon and remission by means of this ransom, which was mentioned above by Ambrose, and granted to men universally, but denied to angels. It is clear, because the value of the death of Christ is estimated from the dignity of the sufferer: it therefore had in itself, intrinsically, not only a sufficiency, but an infinite superabundance, even if there should be placed in the other scale the sins, not only of all mankind, but of the fallen angels. There is therefore to be granted, with respect to mankind, not only that mere sufficiency, which depends upon the inherent dignity of the thing offered, but that ordained sufficiency which arises from the intention and act of Christ referring this his passion to all mankind, and not referring it to the fallen angels. This being granted, Christ is truly said to have died for all men sufficiently with that sufficiency which does not exist with

regard to the apostate angels, and of which it may be truly said, that Christ did not die either effectually or sufficiently for the fallen angels.

OBJECTION. But perhaps some one may meet this argument and assert, That the mere sufficiency of the thing offered, considered in itself, makes out as to men, that Christ may be rightly said to have suffered for all sufficiently; but does not make it out as to devils, because (Ames, Coron. p. 99) that that *ransom is not sufficient which is not apt and suitable. But a great part of the aptitude in Christ to take away the sins of mankind consisted in his assuming the likeness of sinful flesh. Since, therefore, he did not take on himself the nature of angels, he was not in a suitable condition, nor was his death sufficient to take away the sins of the evil angels.*

REPLY. This argument is unsound in both parts. For that sufficiency, (whatever aptitude and congruity it may have) if it has not also some ordination and act of offering relative to individuals, does not make out that Christ can be said to have suffered altogether for such persons, much less that he can be affirmed to have suffered for them sufficiently. In vain, therefore, is Christ's assumption of human nature brought forward by those who contend that he died for the elect alone, to deduce from thence that he suffered sufficiently or insufficiently for all mankind. The exception is also weak on the other side, because, although there was not that similitude of nature between Christ and angels which there was between Christ and mankind, yet this could not hinder that the ransom paid by Christ, that is, the blood of God, should be in itself, on account of its own value, most sufficient to take away the sins of angels also. For what guilt of any creature can be so great, that the blood-shedding of God could not suffice for its expiation, which is of infinite value from the dignity of the Divine person; and therefore, notwithstanding the dissimilitude of human nature, if God had deigned to grant this right in the death of Christ to angels, it would also be applicable for the redemption of angels. God indeed was willing to have compassion upon the human race, and not

to have compassion upon angels; he willed that the Redeemer should not assume the angelic nature, but the seed of Abraham. Hence we may conclude, that the death of Christ was not ordained as a ransom for the redemption of angels; but we neither can nor ought to conclude, that it was not a ransom in itself of sufficient dignity, value, and efficacy, if it had been ordained. It might be argued on the other hand, that Christ, notwithstanding the dissimilitude of nature, is a sufficient, fit, and suitable head to communicate grace even to angels, from whence it is asserted by the most learned Divines, that the gifts of grace are merited even by the good angels. Since, therefore, the merits of Christ do not profit the evil angels, it is not to be referred to the insufficiency of the thing, but to the will of God alone; and consequently, if we affirm that there are many human beings to whom the passion and merit of Christ is in no way ordained, as to the sufficiency of the death of Christ, the state and condition of these will not be different from that of the devils.

ARGUMENT 4. We prove that the mere sufficiency in itself of the thing offered cannot verify that dogma of Divines, *That Christ died for all men sufficiently;* and this appears from the confession of those who deny that the death of Christ was paid for the whole human race, and who limit it to the elect alone. Thus Piscator* (in Resp. Apologet. Sec. 87), *It cannot be said, That Christ died for all mankind sufficiently, because it would follow that he died for all, the contrary to which is demonstrated.* And in the same place, *That distinction which is made, That Christ died for all mankind sufficiently, for the elect effectually, is vain, because it implies a contradiction,* &c. It implies a real con-

* PISCATOR or FISCHER (John), a German Protestant Divine, born at Strasburg, in 1546. He was successively a Lutheran, a Calvinist, and an Arminian. But his attainments in divinity became so celebrated, that he was invited to accept the Professor's Chair at Herborn, which he filled with such effect as to draw many students thither from different parts of Europe. He was very diligent and laborious; translated the Bible into German, and was the author of Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, which are said to be valuable. His works were collected in four Vols. folio. He died in 1626. *Vide Moshcim and Middleton.*

tradiction in those who admit a mere sufficiency of his death as to all mankind, and deny its universal ordination to procure salvation for all men. They are bound, therefore, to explode this distinction, which has been hitherto approved by the orthodox, or to acknowledge with us the ordained sufficiency of the death of Christ for the deliverance of all. The very learned Pareus seems to be of this opinion, when he affirms (Act. Syn. Dord. p. 213), *That as to the sufficiency of his ransom and merit, Christ died and was willing to die for each and every man.* Here he does not make the sufficiency consist in this only, that the death of Christ was sufficient of its own intrinsic value to redeem all, but also, in the will of Christ dying and ordaining his death to be sufficient for the deliverance of all. And here it is to be observed by the way, that they are deceived who confine the death of Christ to the elect alone, so as to conclude that he was willing to die for them only, and yet pretend (Palatini Synod. Dord. p. 88) *That there is no question or contention concerning the sufficiency of the ransom of Christ for each and every man; but all the controversy is respecting the efficacy of this ransom.* Truly, granting the sufficiency of the death of Christ in itself for the redemption of a thousand worlds, and granting also, that the efficacy of this death is destined absolutely and infallibly, not to all, but to certain persons actually to be delivered, yet it still remains a matter of controversy, Whether the death of Christ is supposed to have an intrinsic sufficiency for the redemption of all, under this hypothesis: If it availed to offer and pay that ransom for all, and it had not also joined to it the ordination of God, according to which this ransom, sufficient in itself, was actually offered for all, and from thence is applicable and to be applied for salvation to all, if they should be willing to obey the aforesaid ordination and subject themselves to it. For such an ordination we contend, which regards even those who are not saved, *because they have not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.* And hence we say, That Christ died for all men sufficiently. But here some of those who contend that Christ suffered and died for the elect alone,

nevertheless wish to appear to defend, not the mere sufficiency of the death of Christ in itself, but that ordained sufficiency from the intention of God which we assert. And for this reason, when they are pressed with arguments, they do not refuse to make mention of the will and intention of God. Let us, therefore, examine their mind and opinion more closely, that we may not beat the air, or fight with a man of straw. Thus a learned man has written on this subject (Ames, Coron. p. 117), *When we confess that Christ died for all, that phrase* FOR ALL *is admitted by our party on account of its sufficiency and the intention of God, by which he willed that it should be thus sufficient for all. At the same time it must be observed, that this manner of speaking is improper, but it is not to be rejected, because it has some foundation in the thing itself, and is received among Divines by long use.* Others of the same opinion say (Acta Synod. Dord. p. 99), *That the counsel and decree of God the Father was, that Christ by his suffering and death, should pay a ransom of such a kind, as, considered in itself, might suffice for the reconciliation of all men.* These persons seem to add a sufficiency, besides the mere sufficiency of the thing, relative and pertaining to the reconciliation of all men from the intention and counsel of God. They seem to do this indeed, but do it not in reality. For first, what they say, that they acknowledge that Christ died sufficiently for all, on account of the intention of God, by which he willed that his death might be sufficient for all, is of no account. Since the death of the Son of God did not need any additional intention in order to its being sufficient for all, when it was in itself of infinite value. Yet it needed that it should be given for all, and accepted for their deliverance, under some condition. *Intrinsic sufficiency is a certain power and fitness of a thing;* (Ames, Coron. p. 99) nor is there required, in order to constitute it, the extrinsical act of one intending this sufficiency. But the ordination in behalf of certain persons to be delivered is a voluntary act, and flows from the intention and design of the person ordaining it. It is, therefore, frivolous to join the intention of God with the internal sufficiency of the thing, as the intention ought either

to be altogether denied as to Christ having died sufficiently for all; or to be joined with an ordination of his death pertaining to all. Secondly, what they say, that this phrase, *Christ died for all sufficiently*, has a foundation in the thing itself, cannot be defended from their opinion. If I should say, the death of Christ is a sufficient ransom for all, there is a true foundation for this saying in the thing itself, namely, in the dignity of the person dying; but if I should say, Christ died or was offered on the cross (which are equivalent) for all sufficiently, there is now no foundation on which the truth of this saying can stand, unless I assert first, that Christ suffered and was offered for all, and then add the sufficiency of this suffering for all, on account of the dignity of the ransom. He who denies one of these, in vain attempts to defend the other. We therefore conclude, that neither can Christ be truly said to have suffered or died for all sufficiently, nor can the death of Christ be truly acknowledged to be an universal remedy applicable to all men according to the ordination of God, unless in addition to the mere sufficiency of the thing derived from its innate dignity, we admit the settled and fixed decree of God, according to which, from the will of God in accepting this sacrifice, and of Christ in offering it, this death of Christ is able to bring eternal life to each and every man. Hitherto we have treated of the first part of our proposition, in which we have shewn, that that mere sufficiency, which is understood of the death of Christ considered in itself, is not enough for the conclusion, that Christ should be said to have died for all, or that his death should be accounted an universal cause of salvation in regard to the whole human race. Let us now shew what that is which is further requisite for this purpose. For the illustration of this subject, the second thesis may serve:

Second. *The death of Christ, according to the evangelical covenant confirmed by it with all men, is affirmed to have been truly endured for all men, and Christ, in the same respect, is asserted to have died sufficiently for all men.* We allude to that covenant of which we have before made mention, *If thou shalt believe, thou shalt be saved;* or *Who-*

soever believeth shall be saved. Rom. x. 9. That this covenant concerning the grant of remission of sins, and the salvation of mankind through faith, was confirmed by the blood-shedding and death of the Son of God, appears, in the first place, from the sacred Scriptures. In the institution of the Lord's supper, Christ himself says (Luke xxii. 20), *This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.* As if he had said, It is a lively symbol of the Lord's blood, by which the new covenant concerning the remission of sins and our justification by faith is confirmed and established. And the Apostle says (Heb. ix. 22), *Without shedding of blood is no remission.* Therefore, the covenant made with men, by which God bound himself to remit the sins of those that believe, has its strength or virtue in the death of Christ. The same Apostle teaches, (Rom. iii. 25) that *God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.* Therefore, this evangelical covenant is founded in the blood or death of Christ, according to which, through faith, remission of sins, justification, and eternal salvation are conferred upon mankind. That I may not dwell too long on a subject sufficiently clear, since this conditional promise, *If thou shalt believe, thou shalt be saved,* flows from the gracious kindness of God towards men, it cannot have its foundation elsewhere than in the death and merit of Christ the Mediator, *in whom all the gratuitous promises of God are Yea and Amen.* (2 Cor. i. 20). Nor, indeed, is the act of faith itself of such value, that it can by its own dignity or merit obtain from God remission of sins and salvation. But of such great value is the death and blood-shedding of the Son of God, that by its own merit and virtue it can justify and save any one that believeth, according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant. Therefore this covenant was confirmed by the death of Christ.

But, secondly, that remains respecting which there are great scruples, namely, Whether this evangelical covenant, *If thou shalt believe, thou shalt be saved,* which we have shewn to be confirmed by the death of Christ, pertains, accord-

ing to the Divine ordination, to the whole human race, or only to individuals, and to certain persons in particular. We contend that it was confirmed with the whole human race. Which may appear, *First*, from the command and promise of Christ himself, who, after he had endured and conquered death, sent his Apostles into all the world, (Mark xvi. 15, 16) *And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.* On which words of promise, the learned Calvin has rightly remarked, *That this promise was added that it might allure the whole human race to the faith.* (Harm. Evang. p. 374). It is therefore understood to have been established with the whole human race. For a promise has no power of alluring others to any action than those for whom it is presupposed to have been made. *Secondly*, The same appears from the practice of the Apostles, and of all the ministers of the Gospel, conformable to the command and promise of Christ For these, without any respect of nation or predestination, boldly promise forgiveness of sins on condition of faith to each and every person who assembles to hear them. By this act they acknowledge, that the covenant concerning the forgiveness of sins through faith, confirmed by the blood of Christ, is universal. For a conditional covenant cannot be seriously proposed, and a benefit annexed be promised conditionally to those persons to whom the covenant itself is not extended by the will of the maker of it. For example, if a King makes an agreement with certain persons who have been found guilty of high treason, that he will pardon them if they will humbly ask pardon of him; it would not be lawful for this reason for any of the King's servants to go to the prison and announce to all persons there promiscuously, that pardon would be obtained from the King, if they would only humbly kneel down and ask it; because this conditional agreement regards those only who are included in it by the Royal clemency. Therefore neither would it be lawful for the ministers of God to promise promiscuously to all men remission and salvation on the

condition of faith, unless it appeared to them beyond a doubt, that this conditional covenant was made and established for all by the will of God. But the Apostles did this, and we do it; therefore we acknowledge that this covenant was established with each and every man, that is, with the whole human race. But perhaps some one may say, Although this covenant, confirmed by the blood of Christ, should not pertain to all men promiscuously, but only to the elect, yet remission of sins and salvation may be proposed and offered to all, under the hypothesis of faith, because it is certain that the elect alone will perseveringly believe; and therefore none of the non-elect can ever cause this covenant, which is conditional on the part of God, to be false or violated as to himself. But this answer is of no avail. For the truth of every conditional proposition is to be considered, before the condition is allowed; therefore, although the condition should never be acted upon, still the truth of the conditional proposition, when rightly made, ought to appear. Therefore, this conditional proposition or promise, *If thou shalt believe, thy sins shall be forgiven thee,* is false as to Cain and Judas, unless a true foundation of the connexion should be granted, in case it should happen that they believed. Nor does it at all relate to the truth of the conditional proposition whether they should believe or not, since in such a proposition, the reason of the connexion is regarded, not the truth or falsity of the separate parts. *If Peter should deny Christ, he shall obtain eternal life,* is a false proposition, on account of the weakness of the connexion, and yet each part separately was true. *If Peter should not believe, he will not obtain eternal life,* is a true proposition, and yet each part taken separately was false. For Peter both believed and obtained eternal life. For a like reason, therefore, this conditional declaration *If thou shalt believe, thou shalt obtain remission of sins and eternal life,* would be false as to a non-elect person, although it should be presupposed that he would never believe, if the antecedent reason and cause of connexion were wanting: but it is wanting, unless a conditional covenant confirmed with all

men individually is asserted. For it does not follow from the declaration, That God by the death of Christ confirmed a covenant concerning the salvation of all the elect through faith; Therefore, If Cain should believe, he shall be saved. The conditional covenant, therefore, is established with the whole human race. *Thirdly,* We prove that this evangelical covenant, confirmed by the death of Christ, concerning the giving of salvation on the condition of faith, is universal, by urging further this same argument, and that from the concessions of those who seem to be opposed to us. Those who endeavour to restrict the death of Christ as much as possible, nevertheless grant, that by the merit of his death, *there is a way and method appointed, by which any unbeliever may escape deserved condemnation, namely, if he should believe.* (Collat. Hag. p. 154). They grant, *that the death of Christ would abundantly suffice to save all men, how many soever they may be in the whole world who believe in him.* They allow also, *That the word of the Gospel concerning Christ crucified, should be announced indiscriminately to the elect and non-elect, and all should be commanded to believe in him, this promise being added, that all who believe in him shall obtain remission of sins.* (Acta. Synod. Dord. p. 29, and 2 part, p. 89). These tLings being granted, I argue thus: If mankind, howsoever many they be in the whole world, would obtain remission of sins and salvation, if they should believe; then an universal covenant was established by the death of Christ concerning the salvation of any man whatsoever under the aforesaid condition of faith. But the first is true: Therefore also the second. The reason of the consequence is this, Because that conditional declaration, which they admit both as to the non-elect, and the elect, namely, *If thou shalt believe, whosoever thou art, thou shalt be saved,* is not as necessarily true from the nature of the thing, as this is, *If there is fire, there is heat,* or, *If he is a man, he is an animal;* it remains, then, that its truth be founded in some voluntary ordination of God, by which he hath decreed, as to any human being whatsoever, that the antecedent being true of him, the consequence is so likewise. Since no third foun-

dation can be assigned, on which the truth of the aforesaid conditional declaration can rest. Therefore, it must be acknowledged, That this evangelical covenant is universal from the ordination of God himself, and that it equally regards all men individually.

If any one should object to this, that the Gospel itself was never preached to all men, and therefore neither does the evangelical covenant embrace the whole human race, or pertain to all men individually; I answer, That it does not follow,—*Because the evangelical covenant is not announced to this nation, or that individual, therefore, it was not made or established with regard to them.* But this is a legitimate conclusion, *The evangelical covenant is not of itself annunciable to that nation or this man; therefore, it does not in any way pertain to them.* Since there may be some secret causes why the Gospel is not preached, which prevent it from being announceable to all, which causes it is not my present purpose to ascertain. We say, then, that remission of sins through the death of the Redeemer might have been truly announced in any age, to any nation, and to any man, on condition of faith. Thus, in the time of the old Testament, this covenant was revealed to Job, an alien. So likewise in our own age, if a minister of the Gospel should go to the Antipodes, he would not wait for a new establishment of this conditional covenant, but would at once announce it to them, taking for granted its having been made in their favour. And hence it is that the Apostle calls this word of the Gospel, *the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest*, &c. (Coloss. i. 26.) He acknowledged it, therefore, to have been established from eternity with the human race, although it was hidden or made manifest to one or another, according to the good pleasure of God. See Romans xvi. 25, 26, and Ephesians iii. 5 and 9. It remains that by reason of this universal covenant, established through the death of Christ, with the whole human race; we should shew, that we can affirm in a true and sound sense, that Christ suffered or died for all men, which we wish to dispatch in few words.

But I must premise, in order to verify this form of speech, that it is not necessary, either from the sense of the Scriptures, or from that of the Fathers, or from the meaning of the words themselves, that we should defend the opinion, that all those for whom it is affirmed that Christ was crucified and died, are to be led by the infallible order of predestination to eternal life through the benefit of the death of Christ; although we willingly acknowledge that the intention of Christ in dying was, that some might be saved, which, in its proper place, we shall confirm by testimonies of the Scriptures, and by perspicuous arguments.

First, then, in Scripture language, these two things are not always equivalent, *Christ died for these persons*, and, *God predestinated that through the death of Christ these persons should be infallibly saved;* because the Scriptures often declare universally, that Christ died for all; but never affirm universally, that God predestinated that all men should be saved through the benefit of the death of Christ. For what purpose, I ask, is it that the Spirit of God, in speaking of the death of Christ, frequently makes use of general terms, extending it to all, while in mentioning the Divine predestination, he always uses restrictive terms, limiting it to few, if the death of Christ, and the predestination of God as to mankind, had an equal and altogether the same extent?

Secondly, Because in the sacred Scriptures Christ is said in the same sense *to have reconciled men, to have given himself as a ransom for men, to have died for men*, and he is said also to have reconciled and redeemed the world, inasmuch as the world has in his death an ordained and established universal cause, which, being apprehended by faith by any human being whatsoever, he may be actually reconciled to God and delivered from the guilt of his sins: therefore also, he is rightly conceived to have died for all, inasmuch as all men through his death have eternal life set before them, to be procured by faith. As, therefore, when God is said *to have reconciled the world in Christ*, or Christ is said *to have given himself a ransom for all*, it is not said,

that God predestinated all to be in Christ, so neither is this to be understood, when it is affirmed that he was crucified and died for all.

Lastly, Because the sacred Scriptures clearly extend the death of Christ as a benefit applicable according to the Divine ordination, to those who, through their unbelief, do not apply it to themselves. They extend it, therefore, beyond the number of the elect, of whom there is no one to whom that ransom is not infallibly applied for salvation. This is done in those passages of the Scriptures in which the unbelieving are declared to be condemned, *because they believed not in the name of the only begotten Son of God, who was sent into the world, that the world through him might be saved;* (John iii. 17, 18) *because they would not come to Christ, that they might have life;* (John v. 40) *because they put from them the saving word of God, and judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life,* (Acts xiii. 46); and lastly, because *the promise of entering into the rest of God being disregarded, because of unbelief,* by their own fault *they came short of it.* (Heb. iv. 1.) All these things evince, that according to the sense of the Scriptures, the death and merits of Christ were ordained even for the use of those who despised and rejected them. But that they were not ordained for such persons according to the infallible decree of predestination appears from the event. Therefore, in order to verify the assertion that Christ died for these or the other persons, according to the Scriptures, it is not necessarily required that it should be understood that he died for them, with the absolute purpose of saving them.

From the Scriptures let us descend to the Fathers. It is evident, that the proposition, *Christ died for these men,* had not the same meaning with them as this, *Christ will infallibly save these men by his death.* We shall content ourselves with a very few testimonies, because the thing is well known to those who are moderately versed in the writings of the Fathers. Ambrose, on Psalm cxviii. affirms, that *Christ suffered for all,* and yet immediately subjoins, that *they who do not believe in Christ, deprive themselves of this general benefit.* It did not then appear to Ambrose to be

the same, *that Christ suffered for any one,* and *that he decreed that he should infallibly be saved by his passion.* Prosper (ad Capit. Gallor. resp. 9) *The Saviour is most rightly said to have been crucified for the redemption of the whole world.* Yet he also affirms, (Sent. 9) *Although the blood of Christ be the ransom of the whole world, yet they are excluded from its benefit, who, being delighted with their captivity, are unwilling to be redeemed by it. So that of these it may be truly said, the Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world, and the world would not be redeemed.* (Ad Cap. Gallor. resp. 9.) Prosper, then, did not think these two things one and the same; that *Christ was crucified for these persons,* and that *Christ will procure that these persons shall be infallibly saved.* Theophylact, on Heb. ii. 9, *God gave his own Son to death for us, not for believers only, but for the whole world. For though all are not saved, yet he fulfilled all that he was in duty bound to do.* From which words it appears that it was not the same to Theophylact for any one to say, *Christ was given by God to die for all,* as if he should say, *Christ, from the absolute good pleasure of God, will save all men by his death.* Further testimonies are unnecessary. Yet I add, that it cannot be inferred, merely from the words *Christ died for all,* that Christ so died for all, that he absolutely decreed to bring about by this his death the salvation of all effectually and infallibly; because he may with sufficient truth and propriety be said to die for any one, who dies to procure the good of another, although the other by his own fault may not receive any advantage from it. The particle *for* denotes respect to another in the will and intention of the person dying, but does not perpetually and necessarily involve in it such a respect, that no one can be rightly said to die for another, but he who determines by his death absolutely and infallibly to deliver the other from death. What if under any condition he should make deliverance from death possible to guilty men, which without his death was impossible? Would it not be justly affirmed for that reason alone, that he died for them? Ambrose has asserted, in writing on Cain and Abel, (ii. 3), that *Christ came for the salvation of all, and undertook the redemption of*

all, inasmuch as he brought a remedy by which all might escape, although there are many who impute to themselves the causes of his death, who are unwilling to be healed. We do not, therefore, deny that the particle *for* in the sacred Scriptures, when used about the death of Christ, sometimes denotes that special intention, according to which deliverance from death and translation into life is infallibly destined to those for whom he is asserted to have died; but we deny that this is so perpetually or necessarily the case, that the truth of the assertion, *Christ died for all,* will not stand, unless it is granted that he had an absolute intention of saving all.

It appears now that the secret and absolute good pleasure of God concerning the salvation of men, according to the infallible decree of predestination, is not necessary for this purpose, so that Christ may be rightly and truly said to have suffered and died for all. What then is necessary? I will tell you in few words. Forasmuch as the death of Christ has a twofold respect; one to God, to whom this precious ransom was offered and paid, another to men, for whom it was offered and paid; Christ may be said to have suffered, to have been offered, or to have died for all, if it should appear that by his death and passion he had effected, that God might be understood to be otherwise disposed as to giving eternal life to all men, than he would have been without the death of Christ; and also, if it should appear that any man might claim for himself by virtue of the death of Christ, a right to the remission of sins and eternal life, which, without this death, he could not possibly have or claim in any way. Either of these plainly shews, that the efficacy of the death of Christ extends itself to the whole human race, and therefore, that we neither speak falsely nor improperly when we say that Christ died for all mankind.

As to the first, It is certain, that through regard to the death of Christ, the will of God is now otherwise ordered towards all men individually than it would be without it. For by this, that Christ in his own human nature suffered death, without any other intervening medium, it has at

least been effected with God, that he is willing to be reconciled to any man who believes and repents, to pardon his sins, and to confer upon him eternal life. Hence, on the part of God, remission was prepared for Cain, if he should do well and repent. (Gen. iv. 7.) Hence it is said to any wicked man in the name of God himself, *If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die.* (Ezek. xviii. 21.) Take away the regard to the death of Christ which is present to the mind of God and which embraces the human race, and there is nothing serious, solid, or true in promises of this kind as to the non-elect. For the conditional promise of remission ought to have its truth in the death of Christ as much as the remission itself, which is granted on the performance of the condition. Nor does it at all avail to diminish the universal efficacy which the death of Christ hath obtained with God, that none of the non-elect fulfil the evangelical condition of faith and repentance; for it is sufficient, that by virtue of the death of Christ, and the ordination of God established through it, if the condition should be fulfilled by any man whatsoever, the benefit of remission and of eternal life would undoubtedly follow.

Now as to the latter of these, It is also certain and directly connected with it, That any man whatsoever, through the benefit of the death of Christ, may claim to himself this right, that if he should believe, immediately all his sins are blotted out, and he is adopted as an heir of eternal life. For although on account of the want of fulfilment of the condition many cannot actually claim these promised blessings, yet there is no human being to whom they would not abound by virtue of the death of Christ, if the condition were fulfilled by him. This conditional decree of God, established by the death of Christ and revealed in the Gospel, from which we understand that God, by virtue of the passion of Christ, has obliged himself to give remission of sins and eternal life to every one that believeth, and from which an universal right has arisen, not to certain persons in particular, but to any individual of the human race, to obtain remission of sins under the aforesaid

condition, is abundantly sufficient for this purpose, that it may be truly asserted that Christ suffered for all men. Nor is this conditional decree confirmed by the death of Christ and extended to all men, a thing of no value, because the infallible fulfilment of the condition depends upon another secret decree; since that secret decree, inasmuch as it relates to this or the other individual, is altogether unknown to us, and therefore not to be declared to any one by name; but this conditional decree, which comprehends the whole human race, is to be announced to every individual as the most solid foundation of our evangelical doctrine, according to that declaration of the Apostle (Romans x. 8, 9, 11,) *This is the word of faith which we preach, That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.* This benefit by virtue of the death of Christ is set before, and to be procured by all men, under the condition of faith; and in that respect Christ is affirmed to have died for all men.

One thing only now remains; that we should demonstrate that this condition of faith, under which remission of sins and eternal life is promised to all men individually through the death of Christ, is possible.

We have taught that Christ died for all men, in the sense, that the evangelical covenant was established, through the death of Christ, with the whole human race; according to which, remission of sins and eternal life is set before all men, under the possible condition of faith. Some persons, fixing the eyes of their mind solely on the secret of predestination and reprobation, cannot conceive how Christ, faith, remission of sins, eternal life, or any spiritual and saving good, can in any way, or under any possible condition, pertain to those who were not included in the number of the predestinated before the foundation of the world; although Christ may be offered to them in the preaching of the Gospel, although faith may be required of them, although remission of sins and eternal

life to be obtained through Christ may be promised to them, under the condition of faith. We shall therefore briefly shew,

THIRDLY, *That this condition of faith, which is required in order that the death of Christ, which was endured for all, may be applied to any person individually, neither is, nor ought to be conceived by us to be altogether impossible to any person living.* This, however, is to be remembered, that from the beginning we have inculcated, that this possibility is founded on the supernatural assistance which may possibly be received by any one, while he is in the land of the living, according to that celebrated saying of Prosper of Aquitain (Object. Vincent. Resp. 6), *There is this difference between wicked men and devils, that for men, however wicked, a reconciliation is provided, if God should have compassion upon them; but for devils there is no conversion reserved at all.*

First, then, when we say, *that faith thus to believe is a thing possible to any person living,* we regard not its active and formal power, as if any one living could of his own free will elicit this act of believing; but its passive and material power, as it is called, because God may effect in any one that he should be converted and believe the Gospel. For we are said to *be able to do any thing* in two ways, as Aquinas has well observed, namely, *either by the power which is in us, as we say that a stone can be moved downwards; or by power considered on the part of another, as we say that a stone can be moved upwards, not by its innate power, but by the power of the person who throws it.* Quæst. disp. De Præd. art. resp. ad 7. According to this mode we affirm that any living person can believe, or that the condition of faith is possible to any one who is in the land of the living, not by any innate power resident in himself, but by the supernatural assistance which can be supplied by God at any time to any man, according to the saying of John the Baptist (Luke iii. 8), *I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.* Therefore there is no heart so obdurate and stony, that it cannot be softened by God, and be turned to faith and repentance. This is what Augustine signified in other

words, when he wrote, *To be able to have faith is in the nature of men, but to have grace is peculiar to believers.* (De Prædestinat. Sanctor. cap. 5.) To this also Augustine alluded in his Soliloquies (lib. ii. cap. 1,) where, when he had said, *We would believe, if it were in our power,* he afterwards subjoins, *Our power is God himself.*

Secondly, When we refer this possibility of having faith to the active power of God, and to the receptive power of man, this is to be understood not only of the absolute power of God, but of his ordinary power. For among Divines some things are said to be possible by the absolute power of God, and some things by his ordinary power. It will not be foreign to our purpose to make this distinction, when we have explained it in a few words. That, then, is said to be possible by the absolute power of God, which, from the nature of the thing, does not involve a contradiction if it should be done; that, on the other hand, impossible, which does involve a contradiction. And under this consideration, as Thomas rightly says, (Part. qu. 25, art. 3,) *Whatever can have a manner of being is reckoned among these absolute possibles, but among the impossibles, what cannot have a manner of being; as for instance, whatever implies in itself that it both is and is not, at the same time.* That such things are not subject to Divine Omnipotence, does not argue any defect in God. Because, as there is no defect in visual power because it does not apply to that which is not visible, so neither is there a defect in absolute power because it is not extended to that which is not possible. It is sufficient therefore for establishing the omnipotence of God, that it can do whatever is possible to be done. But of those things which are otherwise, *it is more properly said, that such things cannot be done, than that God cannot do such things.* For this some refer to Luke i. 37, *With God nothing shall be impossible,* that is, whatever can be conceived, even implying a contradiction to what may be supposed by any person, *that* can be done by God. Therefore the rule of judging what God can do of his absolute power ought to be taken from the thing itself; because where there is not a defect of impossibility on the

part of the thing, there is no defect of power on the part of God. But this absolute power is not that which we properly and principally regard in our thesis, but rather that power which we call *ordained* or *ordinary*. Now this is understood, as Bannes* rightly says, (In 1mo. qu. 23, art. 3, p. 276) *in the order of any common law given and promulgated by God, according to which any thing is understood as possible to be done, or not to be done; or also according to the common course of natural or moral things.* In this sense we affirm, howsoever the secret decree of the Divine will concerning the giving or not giving of faith to certain individuals is unknown to us, yet, because there is no common law promulgated by God decreeing the opposite, we ought to declare respecting any living person whatsoever, That the condition of faith and repentance is possible to him, according to the ordinary power of God; as, on the other hand, we rightly say, that according to his ordained or ordinary power, faith and repentance are impossible to any of the damned. This possibility of having faith, which regards every living person, is confirmed by a threefold argument:

The *first* is derived from the Divine mercy; for, as Prosper says, *God takes away from no person* (living) *the way of correction, nor does he deprive any one of the possibility of good.* (Ad Obj. Vinc. Resp. 25.) Although he hath established a law respecting the grant of remission of sins and eternal life to every penitent believer. *I have no plea-*

* Domingo Bañes, or Dominicus Bannesius, mentioned also a little before, at page 407, was a Spaniard born at Valladolid in 1527. At the age of 15 he went to Salamanca, and after completing a course of study there, he entered into the Order of Preaching Friars. After he had taken the vows of his order, he was Professor of Theology for more than thirty-two years at Avila, Alcala de Henarez, Valladolid, and Salamanca, and died at Medina del Campo, Nov. 1, 1604, aged 77 years. Besides some Commentaries on different writings of Aristotle, and one or two other pieces, he wrote Commentaria Scholastica in primam partem Summæ S. Thomæ, necnon in secundam Secundæ—the work which Davenant cites. Venetiis, 1602, in three Vols. folio; also at Douay in 1614—16, in two Vols. folio. The first Edition appeared at Salamanca between the years 1584 and 1594. (*Biographie Universelle*, Tom. III. pp. 310, 311).

sure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. (Ezek. xxxiii. 11). Therefore, not only according to the absolute power of God, but according to his ordinary power, any unbelieving and impenitent person whatsoever may be endued with true repentance and saving faith. Of the unbelieving Jews, the Apostle truly says, (Rom. xi. 23), *God is able to graft them in again.* And of all obstinate sinners it is rightly declared in the name of God (Rev. ii. 21), *I gave them space to repent, and they repented not.* He has so granted to mankind the whole space of this life, that in any moment of it conversion to God may bring salvation to them, according to the celebrated saying of the prophet Ezekiel (xviii. 21, 22), *If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed,* &c. *all his transgressions,* &c. *shall not be mentioned unto him.* God hath reserved to himself that according to his ordinary power he can bestow upon any one who is not among the damned in hell, the grace of faith and repentance. Hence it is that we ought not to determine any one to be out of the possibility of salvation whom the patience of God suffers to live.

Secondly, The same thing may be shewn by an argument deduced from regard to Christ, as the head of the body, to every living person. For although the natural head has no power of influence except over the members joined and united to it, yet this mystical head can act towards members separated from it, and communicate to them quickening grace, by means of which they may become united to it. In which sense Aquinas hath not badly stated, (Part. 3, qu. 9, art. 3,) *That Christ is the head of all men, but in different degrees.* He is principally said to be the head of those who are united to him by an actual communication of his glory. But in a less degree he is the head of those who, according to the ordinary law of God, may yet be united to him, whether that power be brought into action or not. But of those who have no capability of receiving the influence of Christ, he can in no way be called the head. The damned, and those alone, ought to be considered in this state; because, according to the pro-

mulgated will of God, there is no redemption from hell. Therefore, the possibility of having faith, as to every one who is living in this world, is founded on the virtue of Christ the head being most sufficient to influence them, and on the aforesaid mercy of God, who, according to his common law, is willing to grant the whole space of this life for their reception.

Thirdly, and lastly, It appears from the different condition of mankind while they are living, and after they have come to the end of life, that the condition of faith and repentance, by which the death of Christ is applicable for salvation to any human being, is possible while they are in this world. From the consent of all Divines, the will of any living person may in this world be turned to that which is good; as, on the other hand, the will of the damned is in their state immoveably confirmed in evil. This is clearly the case with respect to both. Nobody doubts that after this life the state of wicked men is immoveably fixed and altogether unchangeable. For, as Damascenus rightly says (lib. 2, cap. 4,) *What their fall was to angels, such is death to men. If the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be.* (Eccles. xi. 3.) On the other hand, the will of men placed in this mortal life may be changed, and their wickedness removed, so that, by the ordinary power of God, any unbeliever may be enlightened, any impenitent may be converted; in one word, any wicked man may be justified and saved. Whence that exhortation of the Apostle (2 Tim. ii. 25, 26,) *In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.* He intimates, therefore, that this may as yet be done, and that it ought to be hoped for by us. Not dissimilar is that declaration of Peter (2 Epist. iii. 9,) *The Lord is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.* Augustine says (Epist. 54,) *There is no other place for the correction of manners, than in this life.* And Clemens Alexan-

drinus truly remarks (Strom. lib. 4, p. 235,) *While we are in this life there is no time either too late or too soon to obtain the health of the soul.* Who shall receive faith and repentance from God before he departs out of this life, and who shall not receive them, is a secret, depending on the will of him who *hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he leaves hardened.* (Rom. ix. 18.) In the mean time, if we regard the ordinary law of God, we shall rightly say of any persons still continued in this life, as Augustine says (De Præd. Sanct. cap. 5,) *All men have not faith, but the possibility of having faith is common to all.*

Against this our opinion, which makes faith a condition possible to any living person, and the death of Christ applicable, through that possible condition, to any man, some things may be objected.

1. The most common objection is, *That power is in vain, which is not brought into action.* For to what purpose do we attribute to God an ordinary power to enlighten and convert any living man; to what purpose do we attribute to Christ the head a power of influencing him; to what purpose do we attribute to any man a power of receiving this influence of saving grace, when it appears that this power is never to be brought into action as to the greater part of men?

We reply, As far as relates to the power of God, this saying is by no means to be admitted. Because, as Aquinas learnedly observes, (Part. i. qu. 25, art. ii. resp. ad. 2) *That is in vain which is ordained for an end which it does not attain: but the power of God is not ordained for any external effect as its end, but is itself rather the end of its own effect.* Therefore, although God should not have created the world, nor should save any mortal man, yet the power in God of creating and saving would not be vain or needless. For a like reason that power is not in vain in God or in Christ, by which he is able, according to a law made and promulgated by himself, to bestow upon any living man the grace of faith and repentance, although he will not vouchsafe that grace to multitudes of the human race. Now as to the receptive power, which God hath willed

should extend to all men, even to the very close of this life, a power of this kind would indeed be in vain, unless it should be effectual in some persons; but that it is not effectual as to all mankind, is to be referred partly to the secret will of God, partly to the manifest depravity of men. In both respects, through the capacity or power of faith and salvation, which is not effectual as to many, God obtains a greater manifestation of his mercy towards the elect, and of his justice towards the wicked, unbelieving, and impenitent of mankind; and therefore such power is not granted to them in vain. Alvarez* well says, (De Auxiliis, disp. 105) *In order that any power may not be in vain, it is not required that it should sometimes be exerted in some action which it can effect, but it is sufficient that it may be exerted in some one or more of them.* For as no one could truly say, that power was given in vain to men by nature to understand Mathematics, although many who are capable of learning them, do not actually find masters to instruct them; so can no man affirm that this power to believe and repent is granted in vain to all living men by the fixed law of God, although God does not effectually work in all men faith and repentance.

2. It is also objected, that it seems to cause greater doubts in the mind, that God should not only have foreknown from eternity, but have predestinated to whom he would infallibly give faith, remission, and eternal life, and to whom he would not give it. But God cannot do other things in time, or act otherwise than he foreknew from eternity and decreed that he would act. Abelard†

* Alvarez *(Diego)*, a Spanish Dominican who distinguished himself in the Controversy between the Thomists and Molinists, and became Archbishop of Trani, in the kingdom of Naples. He wrote *Commentaries upon Isaiah: De Auxiliis Divinæ Gratiæ: Responsiones ad objectiones adversus Concordiam Liberi Arbitrii et Præscientiæ Divinæ; De Origine Pelagianæ Heresis.* He died in 1635.

† Abelard, the celebrated Scholastic, as renowned in his day for his erudition, as for the romantic amour on account of which, perhaps, his name has been since most noted. He flourished in the 12th Century. Mosheim thus speaks of him in this period:—"the disciple of Anselm, and most famous in this century on account of the elegance of his wit, the ex-

formerly relying on this argument, boldly asserted, *That God could not possibly do any thing beside those things which he has done, or is about to do.* (Wal. doct. fidei, Tom. 2, lib. i. cap. 1.) If this should be true, since it is certain as to the greater part of men, that God neither foreknew nor decreed that faith should be produced in them, yet there is no reason why we should say that this condition of faith is possible in any way as to the non-elect, although they are living in this world.

We reply, It is most true that God neither does nor permits any thing, without his eternal decree and eternal foreknowledge preceding. But if any one should from thence conclude that God cannot do any thing according to his ordinary power, except those things which he hath foreknown and decreed should be done, it is most false. For as our Hales rightly says, (Part. 1, qu. 21, art. 4, memb. 2) *The Divine power is not limited either by the will or the foreknowledge of God, although his foreknowledge and will always accompany the manifestation of Divine power in action.* Aquinas gives the reason of this sufficiently plain, (Part. 1, qu. 25, art. 5, ad 1) namely, *Because his act is subject to the foreknowledge and ordination of the doer, but not his ability to do that which is according to nature. For God does any thing, because he will, but it is not because he will, that therefore he is able to do it, but because he is able in his own nature.* Aquinas likewise answers the aforesaid objection in form, (Quæst. disp. de potentia Dei, art. 5, resp. ad 1^mo.) His words are as follows: *This saying,* THAT GOD CANNOT DO ANY THING BESIDES WHAT HE HATH FOREKNOWN THAT HE WOULD DO, *is twofold; because the exceptive particle* BESIDES *refers either to the power which is denoted by the word* CAN, *or to the act which is denoted by the word* DO. *If it is referred to the first of these, the saying is false; for God can do more things than he foreknew that he would do. If to the second, then the meaning is,*

tent of his erudition, the power of his rhetoric, and the bitterness of his unhappy fate." He is generally regarded as the author of the Scholastic System which gave rise to so many subtleties in this age, and became so serviceable to Rome.

that it cannot be that any thing should be done by God, which is not foreknown by God. Thus the saying is true, but this meaning is nothing to the purpose. But since some persons so totally apply themselves to the contemplation of the eternal and secret will and foreknowledge of God, that they admit hardly any thing else into their minds, we will shew briefly, that neither the Scriptures, nor the fathers, nor reason itself, permit that we should determine according to these secret and eternal decrees of predestination, what is possible or impossible with God according to his ordinary power.

We will begin with the Scriptures; which do not confine the power of God according to the secret decrees of his will, but extend it according to his infinite might, and according to the rule revealed in the word. (Matt. iii. 9,) *God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.* (Mark x. 27,) *With God all things are possible.* (Matt. xxvi. 53,) *Thinkest thou not that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?* (Mark xiv. 36,) *All things are possible unto Thee, take away this cup from me.* Thus also the Apostle speaks of the rebellious Jews, *God is able to graft them in again* (Rom. xi. 23.) And of any fallen man, *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own Master he standeth or falleth: yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand* (Rom. xiv. 4.) And lastly, of every living man it is true, *God is able to make all grace abound toward* him (2 Cor. ix. 8.) I mention no more; from these it appears sufficiently, that we are not to judge of the power of God from his secret decrees: for he did not decree of stones to raise up children to Abraham, nor to deliver Christ from the hands of the Jews, nor to raise up and make to stand every fallen man, nor to shed the abundance of his grace on every one; yea, he decreed and foreknew that he would not do all these things, which nevertheless (if we are willing to attend to the holy Scriptures), are not on that account to be esteemed impossible.

Augustine, on this opinion, *The Omnipotent Will can do many things which he neither wills nor does,* urges the case of

Judas, without controversy a reprobate, and says, *The Lord, who raised Lazarus in the body, could he not raise Judas in mind? He could indeed, but he would not.* What Augustine does not fear to affirm concerning Judas, we boldly affirm concerning any living person, notwithstanding the secret will and foreknowledge of God of the opposite, namely, that God can raise any one in mind, that is, can give repentance, and faith, and saving grace; because he hath not revealed concerning any particular person, that he will not do this, and of any one whatever he hath revealed that he can do this by his ordinary power, while he is in the land of the living. To this will we ought to submit ourselves, and not to conjecture about the possibility or impossibility of things according to his will, altogether unknown to us.

Lastly, Reason itself teaches, that God's ordinary power is not to be confined by the secret decrees of eternal pre destination. First, Because we human beings perceive that our power is not to be limited according to the pleasure of our will. He who hath most firmly determined with himself not to give alms to a certain person, does not on that account lose the power of giving; and on the other hand, he who hath determined to give to another, hath not for that reason taken away from himself the power of not giving. For, as he freely willed one of these opposite things when he might have willed the other, so also he freely does the one without losing the power of doing the other. If this is the case with man, whose power is mutable, and liable to be lost, how much more with God, whose power is immutable, eternal, and always the same.

Secondly, Because if we make the ordinary power of God to be bound, and as it were circumscribed by his eternal and secret decrees, we cannot seek any thing from God with a certain faith, I will not say that he will, but that he can help us. For instance, If I should perceive myself to be assaulted by Satan with some grievous temptation, I cannot go to God with an assurance of faith, as if he were able to deliver me, because it is uncertain to me what he hath decreed from eternity respecting this thing. For a

like reason we cannot pray to God that he would convert any unbelievers to the faith, or that he would bring any wicked men to repentance, with a full persuasion that he can do that which we ask, because what he hath secretly decreed concerning these things before the foundation of the world is concealed from us.

Thirdly, and lastly, Because if nothing else is judged possible to be done, except those things which God hath decreed to be done, it would follow that the Divine power is not infinite. That power is finite which is equalized with finite effects, and is wholly drawn out into its own act. Since as Hales rightly observes, (Part. 1. qu. 21) *Infinite power may be drawn out into its act, but not the whole of it.* Therefore, God can do many things which he will not, as for instance, he can give faith to justify, and save any individual person whatever. Yea, he can will many things which he does not will; *and yet his will cannot in any way be either new or mutable. But although he could will what he never hath willed, yet he cannot will unwillingly, or with a new will, but only with an eternal will. For he can will what he could have willed from eternity. For he has the power of willing, both now and from eternity, that which nevertheless he neither does now will, nor hath willed from eternity.* Thus Lombard hath rightly remarked (Lib. 1, Dist. 43. Litera E.)

We have thought that these things should be discussed rather at length, that it may more plainly appear that the death of Christ is applicable to any man living, because the condition of faith and repentance is possible to any living person, the secret decree of predestination or preterition in no wise hindering or confining this power either on the part of God, or on the part of men. They act, therefore, with little consideration who endeavour, by the decrees of secret election and preterition, to overthrow the universality of the death of Christ, which pertains to any persons whatsoever according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant. Thus much we have said respecting our second proposition. Let us proceed to the third.

CHAPTER V.

THE THIRD PROPOSITION IS STATED, ILLUSTRATED, AND CONFIRMED.

WE have now discussed our two first propositions, in which we have explained in what sense the death of Christ is to be acknowledged as an universal cause of salvation to mankind; and it has also been shewn, that they do not rightly understand the commonly received axiom of Divines, *That Christ died for all sufficiently, but for the elect effectually*, who, while they admit the mere sufficiency of the thing considered in itself, yet at the same time exclude its ordained sufficiency, which pertains through the will of God to all men individually, according to the tenor of the Evangelical covenant, under the possible condition of faith. But since, on the other hand, some are found who improperly extend this universal virtue and ordination of the death of Christ, which is to be considered on this account alone, viz. because Christ offered himself upon the cross for all mankind; a third proposition is to be added, which may define the limits to which it extends itself, and beyond which this universal virtue of the death of Christ, which embraces the whole human race, and which arises from the passion of Christ alone, considered without respect to any other medium, does not extend itself.

The third proposition is as follows;

The death or passion of Christ, as the universal cause of the salvation of mankind, hath, by the act of its oblation, so far rendered God the Father pacified and reconciled to the human race, that he can be truly said to be ready to receive into favour any man whatever, as soon as he shall believe in Christ; yet the aforesaid death of Christ does not place any one, at least of

adults, in a state of grace, of actual reconciliation, or of salvation, before he believes.

Of this proposition there are two members, which we shall handle separately and confirm by arguments, when we have premised a few remarks concerning the word *reconciliation* for the clearer understanding of the whole business. It is to be observed then, that God being offended at the sin of man, not only deprived him of his paternal favour and adjudged him to eternal death; but, moreover, irrevocably decreed that he would on no account ever be reconciled to us, whatsoever we might at any time either do or suffer of ourselves. As the displeasure of God was contained in these two steps as it were, so our reconciliation is accomplished by two others, answering to these, as it were, on the opposite side. The first step of reconciliation is then understood to be made, as soon as that is done, although not by us, yet in our name, by which the Divine will is inclined, so that he is now willing to return into favour with us, on the performance of some certain condition, and to bestow remission of sins and eternal life. We affirm that this step to reconciliation is procured for all men by the virtue and merit of the sufferings of Christ, without any other medium. And hence it is (as we have noticed above) that the death of Christ exhibits the redemption or reconciliation of the whole world: *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,* (2 Cor. v. 19.) On which opinion Prosper says (Ad Capit. Gallor. obj. 9), *The Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world,* &c. See also Augustine's Epistles, 151, 171, 173. This reconciliation of the world is, therefore, as it were the first step to the actual reconciliation of individuals, to none of whom would an access to this Divine favour have been opened under the condition of faith, unless it had come to pass that God had been in some way reconciled to the human race by the death of Christ. The latter step to reconciliation consists in this, and is judged to be acquired by any individual person when, the condition of faith in Christ being performed, he is received into the paternal favour of God, he is justified, and is presented with an hereditary

right to eternal life. To this latter step no one comes by the work of Christ alone, by his having offered up himself on the cross to God the Father; but it is necessary, before he obtains this actual reconciliation, to add the act or work of the man himself believing in Christ the Redeemer, and applying the merit of his death to himself individually by faith. To this may be referred John viii. 24, *If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.* Therefore the death of Christ does not deliver from death, nor actually reconcile to God any individual person, except he believe.

Having made this distinction or explanation of the word *reconciliation,* let us return to our proposed thesis, the first member of which, to be confirmed by us in the first place, is thus expressed: *By the act of the death of Christ, God is so far reconciled to every man, that he is ready to admit any one into favour, and moreover, to eternal life, if he should only believe.* We shall discuss this matter in the fewer words, because all that we have said respecting the universal covenant confirmed by the death of Christ, on condition of faith, has regard to this subject. We shall, nevertheless, add some remarks.

First, then, the very tenor of our preaching of the Gospel demonstrates this. For what else do we preach to wicked men, and those who are as yet unbelieving, but that it has been brought about by the death of Christ, that the will of God is far different towards the human race, than it would have been without this death? In other words, that just God who, without the blood of the Mediator, breathed nothing else than wrath and death against us all individually, being now pacified by the blood of the Redeemer, is ready to grant pardon and life to all individually who humble themselves before him and believe in the Mediator. God would never have commanded his ministers to preach this to mankind promiscuously, unless he had been really so disposed in mind; since the Gospel is *the word of truth,* (Col. i. 5) because it announces nothing false or vain to sinners. But it pronounces and promises that God is so far pacified by the efficacy of the blood of Christ shed

upon the cross, that he is ready to embrace any sinner whenever he shall repent and believe. Therefore, the unreasonable speculation of election and reprobation being set aside, the aforesaid efficacy of the death of Christ as to all men individually ought to be acknowledged, and to be preached to all promiscuously.

Secondly. The actual reconciliation of every individual person, which is promised and exhibited to every one that believeth, on account of the merit of Christ crucified, presupposes the first degree of reconciliation; by which God is understood to be so pacified by the death of Christ, that he is now willing, on the performance of the condition of faith, to restore any sinner to his favour. Those therefore who confess that any person, however loaded with sins, as soon as he believes is received into favour on account of the death and merit of Christ, ought not to deny that this is effected by the death of Christ as to all men individually, that they may account God to be ready, yea, obliged to grant this benefit to any one on the aforesaid condition. The antecedent is confirmed, because we cannot conceive that the act of reconciliation proceeds, or is terminated as it were, by a perpetual law, in any person who believes at the very moment in which he apprehends the Mediator by a true faith, unless at the same time we suppose and acknowledge the Divine will to be so prepared and predisposed, by the death of Christ, that he is inclined to grant this favour to any person, provided he should believe. I perceive that this propensity or readiness of the Divine will to grant pardon and grace to any man, as soon as he should perform the condition of faith, is expressed by some persons by the word *placability* or *reconciliability*. Why some Divines so superciliously reject this placability or reconciliability, obtained by the passion of Christ, considered in itself alone, I do not understand. For God would not be actually pacified and reconciled to any man, as soon as he should believe, that is, on the performance of the condition of faith, unless he were placable and reconcileable to any man before he should believe, that is, when the condition of faith should be performed.

OBJECTION. Here some Divines object to us, Then, according to our opinion, God will not be reconciled and pacified to any sinner through and on account of the death of Christ, but only reconcileable and placable: man also by the death of Christ is not reconciled to God, but is reconcileable under some certain condition, namely, of faith.

I answer; that the consequence is faulty. *God is reconcileable by the death of Christ to any man who is about to believe: Therefore he is not reconciled through Christ to every one that believeth, but only is reconcileable.* Truly, we profess that God is reconcileable to every man that believeth, through and on account of Christ; and also that he has given this condition of faith, by means of which actual reconciliation is acquired through and on account of Christ. In vain then, and falsely do they argue from the position of an universal benefit, namely, of reconciliability, on performing the condition of faith, to the removal or denying of particular benefits, as of reconciliation and salvation, since both are derived from the death and merit of Christ; although those general benefits are performed without any act of ours intervening; those particular ones, not without any act of ours, although not on account of any act of ours.

It is objected, secondly, which seems to be of greater importance, If we say that God is, by the death of Christ, made so placable and reconcileable to every man, that he is ready to receive any one into favour, if he should believe, but is not actually reconciled to any one before he believes, then we seem to make the virtue of the death of Christ, as to itself, of little importance to offer itself to all; and God himself also to be indifferent towards all, and as it were to wait for the determination of an inferior cause, that the death of his Son may be beneficial or otherwise; which is nothing else than with the Semipelagians to suspend the salvation or perdition of individuals on the free-will of each, according as they, by faith, apprehend or reject Christ.

I answer, that in order to its being assumed that God by the death of Christ is so far pacified or placable

to mankind, that he will receive into favour any one who should believe, without respect of persons, (which are the very words of the Gospel) yet it does not from thence follow, that this difference of believers and unbelievers, of reconciled and unreconciled, of saved and lost, is to be referred to the uncertain determination of the human will. For he who promulgated this universal decree of the Gospel, *he that believeth shall be saved,* nevertheless hath reserved to himself the special privilege of giving faith to some of his special mercy, and of his not giving it to others of his non-pleasure and on account of their manifest unworthiness. By virtue of the death of Christ, God had bound himself to be reconciled to every man who shall believe; but he hath not bound himself to bestow effectual grace on every man, by which it should be infallibly effected that he should believe. We therefore defend both these things, namely, that God is so far pacified by the death of Christ, that he is now ready to receive into favour any persons whatsoever, if they repent and believe in Christ, and that the same God, who is ready on condition of faith to grant the grace of remission equally to all men, yet has not so provided, that he should conduct himself equally towards all men, as to produce in them this condition of faith. A merchant is said to be ready to sell his wares, if any one is willing to buy them; but that one should be willing and another unwilling to buy them, is not caused by the merchant, but depends on the will of each. The matter is not so between God and us. For although, by virtue of the death of Christ, he is now ready to give remission, and to be reconciled to any man who will believe in Christ, yet it is God's own peculiar prerogative to inspire into all who believe the will of believing. We do not, therefore, join with the Semipelagians, but we say with the Arausican fathers,* (Can. 6) *If any one says that the mercy*

* This refers to the opinion of the Divines assembled at the second Council of Orange, held in the year 529, at the Dedication of the Church which a Nobleman, and Præfect of the Gauls, had caused to be built in the city of Orange, and at which Cæsarius Bishop of Arles, and twelve other Bishops were present. The Council which ensued on this occasion was held

of God is bestowed upon those that believe, will desire and knock without the grace of God, and does not confess that it is through the Divine power that we believe and will, by the infusion and inspiration of the Holy Spirit in us, he opposes the saying of the Apostle, BY THE GRACE OF GOD I AM WHAT I AM. So much for the first part of our proposition; I come now to the other, which is framed in this manner:

The death of Christ, considered as the general cause of the salvation of mankind, delivers no one among adults from the guilt and punishment of their sins; makes no one actually reconciled to God; in one word, places no one in a state of grace and salvation before they believe the Gospel. For the explanation of this proposition, I will premise these few things:

The first is, *That by the death of Christ, generally considered as the cause of the salvation of mankind,* we mean nothing more than the consideration of our Lord's passion in its immediate effect, which it produces of itself, without any concurrence of human actions. We affirm that the immediate effect which is produced, without any thing requisite on our part, is reconciliability, which is brought into action as soon as we believe; but not actual reconciliation, or being placed in a state of adoption and salvation, before we believe.

Another thing which we think should be premised, refers to some difference to be observed in this matter between adults and infants. For it was said, *that none among adults is reconciled to God, or delivered from the guilt of his sins without the act of faith;* (which will be proved hereafter). From whence it is evident, that we admit that some among infants are, by virtue of the death of Christ, absolved from

in consequence of its being understood that there were some persons in the place who held sentiments not in unison with the orthodox faith. The Council drew up 8 articles concerning grace, confirmed by passages of Scripture and a Collection of some sentences out of the Fathers. The articles were not only signed by the Bishops present, but also by Liberius the founder of the Church, and other persons of distinction.—Vide *Du Pin. Councils in the 6th Cent.*

their sins, and placed in a state of salvation without any act of their own will. For as they cannot by faith apply the blood of Christ to cleanse their souls, the God of mercy, by the secret operation of his own Spirit, as it were, sprinkles and quickens their souls by the blood of Christ. This is well observed by Aquinas (Quæst. disp. de Justific. art. 3,) *Because children,* says he, *have no means whereby they can turn themselves to the justifying cause, the justifying cause itself, namely, the passion of Christ, is applied to them in baptism, and by this they are justified.*

The last thing is, By *the state of grace and salvation.* When we deny, that it is attained by any adult before he apprehends the Mediator by the act of faith, we mean that state which the Psalmist has described (Ps. xxxii.) when he says, *Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered;* the same as the Apostle describes (Coloss. i. 13, 14) where he says, that they were *delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son,* and *had redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.*

It is necessary to prove this proposition thus explained, both against those who assert, that by the merit of the passion of Christ all men are received into a state of grace and salvation, and against those who think that the elect at least were from eternity reconciled, justified, and had their sins pardoned. Some attribute the first opinion to the Remonstrants; but, as it appears to me, although they speak ambiguously and obscurely, they are free from this error. Some persons say (Colloq. Hagiens. p. 9) *That Christ by his death upon the cross merited for all men reconciliation and remission of sins.* But they add, *yet so, that none are really partakers of this remission, except those who believe.* Thus they say elsewhere (p. 131,) *That Christ by the death of the cross obtained for all men reconciliation and remission of sins.* But they immediately add this gloss, *That the real participation of this obtained reconciliation and remission is peculiar to those that believe.* And in pp. 162, 163, they expressly reject that opinion which is attributed to them by some persons, namely, *That all men are by the death of*

Christ restored from the fall, and replaced in a state of grace. Nor by *remission obtained for all,* do they mean any more than that *by the death of Christ the means and way is now procured and established, which being made use of and applied by faith, all men individually may obtain remission of sins* (p. 186). Thus they soften down and explain the words which seemed more suspicious in the conference at the Hague.* Yet it is to be confessed that some of them have proceeded a little further in this affair. Borreus, with Arminius, contends, That God hath taken the whole human race into the grace of reconciliation (Resp. ad artic. 13, 14). Arnold against Tilenus† also seems to be of the same opinion (pp. 232 and 261). Huberus and Puccius (whose writings, I confess, I have not yet seen) profess every where that they taught, *that by the death of Christ all men individually were justified and restored to the friendship and favour of God* (Act. Synod. Dordr. p. 1, 8). Now as to the latter opinion, I do not remember to have read of any one of our people who expressly defends it. But our Thomson‡ in his Diatribe (cap. 24, p. 92 and 99) mentions some persons who endeavour to prove that *through the dignity and efficacy of the merits of Christ, the sins of the elect were pardoned from eternity.* If this were granted, it would follow that these persons were justified, reconciled to God, and restored to a state of grace and salvation before they believed in Christ, which is most false. The proof of our

* Held a few years prior to the assembling of the Synod of Dort, viz. in 1611.

† Arnold against Tilenus.—Arnold (Henry) was a Pastor of Delph, who was present at the Synod of Dort, as one of the Deputies from the Churches of South Holland. Tilenus (Daniel) was a disciple of Arminius, Minister of Sedan, and one of the Remonstrants. For an act of his see Life of Bishop Davenant, p. xix.

‡ Thomson (Richard) was a Dutch Arminian, of English parents, and educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge. He published, first, Elenchus refutationis Tortura Torti contra Becanum, Lond. 1611; and afterwards, the Treatise here referred to by Bishop Davenant, Lugd. Bat. 1618, the nature of which will be understood by the title of Bishop Abbott's reply to it, mentioned in a subsequent Note, where that prelate is introduced, a few pages onward.

proposition will be a refutation of both these errors. Therefore we shall confirm it in the first place by testimonies of the Scriptures.

First. That remission of sins does not immediately flow from the passion of Christ to all men universally, without some act of ours intervening, is proved by all those testimonies of the Scriptures which expressly require beforehand the act of repentance. Such as Ezek. xviii. 21, *If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed,* &c. *he shall surely live, he shall not die.* Luke xxiv. 46, 47, *It behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.* 1 John i. 9, *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* From which it appears, that although Christ died for all, yet all do not immediately live through this death of Christ, but that all live as soon as they repent: although remission of sins is offered in the name of Christ, yet all men promiscuously are not made partakers of this benefit, but the penitent alone; and by the same law, that repentance precedes remission. And, although by virtue of the death of Christ, God is bound to remit sins, yet it is in such a way, that neither the faithfulness nor the justice of God requires that this remission should be granted to any one, except on this condition, *If he should confess his sins.*

Secondly, The same is evinced by those passages which, before we can be justified or reconciled to God, previously require faith from us, as the instrument by which we apprehend the grace of justification, and as the condition of obtaining reconciliation, commanded to us in the Evangelical covenant. Of this kind are Acts xvi. 31, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* John vi. 40, *This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.* John xx. 31, *These are written that ye might believe,* &c. *and that believing, ye might have life through his name.* Rom. iii. 22, *The righteousness of God is, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe:* and

ver. 25, *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*, &c. Gal. ii. 16, *Knowing that a man is not justified but by the faith of Christ, we have believed in Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ.* I omit other passages innumerable. From these it appears abundantly, That remission of sins, and justification, or our reconciliation with God, is not a benefit which redounds to any man from the passion of Christ himself, without any other means; but that those for whom Christ died, whether sufficiently or effectually, cannot have the saving benefit of his death applied to them, unless by faith preceding.

Thirdly. This may also be collected from those sayings of the Scriptures in which, the death of Christ being presupposed, it is nevertheless affirmed, that some men lie under the penalty of death, and the wrath of God, even so long as until they apprehend the Mediator with a true faith. To this these passages relate. Mark xvi. 16, *Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.* John iii. 36, *He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* John viii. 24, *If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins.* Lastly, notwithstanding Christ died for us, the Apostle hath said, Eph. ii. 3, *We all were by nature the children of wrath.* In vain, therefore, do any dream, that by the death of Christ all men are restored to the Divine favour and a state of salvation, without the intervention of any act on our part.

Fourthly. Lest any one should say that the aforesaid testimonies relate only to the non-elect, but that all the elect stand justified and reconciled to God by the merit of the death of Christ, before they believe, let them hear these plain testimonies of the Scriptures to the contrary. Ephes. ii. 11, 12, 13, *Remember that ye in time past were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world; but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ.* He addresses those whom (chap. i. 4) he assumes to have

been *chosen before the foundation of the world;* yet he teaches that until that time they had remained strangers from the covenants of promise, and were alienated from God, until by faith, as a spiritual hand, they appropriated to themselves the riches of Divine grace treasured up in Christ; as it may readily be collected from ver. 7 and 8 of this Chap. ii. Of the same meaning are those words of the same Apostle, (Rom. v. 1) *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.* Therefore the death of Christ, considered in itself, until faith is added on our part, does not place any individual in a state of grace. Finally, the Apostle Paul was, without doubt, one of the elect, yet he was not on that account either justified, or brought into a state of grace and salvation, whilst he remained a blasphemer against Christ and a persecutor of the Church, but after he had known Christ and cast himself altogether upon Christ. (1 Tim. i. 16,) *For this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.* Therefore remission of sins through the blood of Christ does not precede faith and repentance, not even in the elect.

Hitherto we have contended with express testimonies of the Scriptures, now let us add some arguments founded on the same Scriptures.

Argument 1. Although we grant that the death of Christ, as a meritorious cause, is most sufficient to expiate the sins of all men, and place them in a state of grace with God, yet, it cannot actually constitute any man justified and reconciled, unless it be in some way joined, fitted, and united to him who is supposed to be justified and reconciled by it. For what philosophers are accustomed to say, *Every action is performed by some contact,* avails also in this supernatural action, which is not performed without some supernatural contact. Now we touch Christ by faith and we are joined and as it were united to him by the Spirit of faith. For *Christ dwelleth in us by faith.* Without faith, then, or before faith, we have no actual union with Christ, and therefore no remission of sins through the me-

rit of his death, no justification, no reconciliation with God the Father. The learned Calvin has observed this on Rom. viii. 4, *Christ communicates his righteousness to none but those whom his Spirit unites by a bond to himself.* Whatever, therefore, is concealed in the eternal decree of God concerning justifying and reconciling to himself, and at length saving all the elect, whatever of sufficiency or efficacy there may be in the precious blood of Christ to redeem men and reconcile them to God, yet it is not wont to proceed into the effect of actual reconciliation, unless he is first joined to men by faith, because both the meritorious and the natural cause ought to be joined to that into which it flows and transfuses its saving virtue.

ARGUMENT 2. It is proved, secondly, from a comparison between Adam, the author of death and condemnation, and Christ, the Author of life and justification. For as Adam does not bind any under the penalty of death, nor subject any to Divine wrath and condemnation, but those who become his members, as it were, by generation; so Christ does not deliver any from death, nor restore any to Divine favour, or justify and reconcile them to God, but those who become his members by supernatural regeneration. But this does not take place before faith is inspired into our hearts. John i. 12, 13, *As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born not of blood,* &c. *but of God.* Therefore no one, either of those who are passed by or of the elect, stands reconciled and justified before God by the death of Christ itself; but at the time when he is incorporated with Christ, and by regeneration is made, as it were, a member of this mystical head, he obtains the righteousness of Christ and peace with God.

ARGUMENT 3. If by the merit of the death of Christ alone all the sins of men were pardoned before they believe in Christ, and so all were actually restored to a state of grace and reconciliation, it would follow that no one is born a child of wrath; which is diametrically opposite to the words of the Apostle just now quoted from Ephes. ii. 3. Moreover, since the merit of Christ in the acceptation

of God has infinite and eternal efficacy, this inconvenience also would follow, That the sins of men were pardoned before they were committed, were expiated before they were perpetrated, if the remission of sins and actual reconciliation of men arose solely from the merit of Christ, without any intermediate act of ours [by which the benefit is conveyed to us]. But this is plainly impossible. For as a medicine, which as to its own efficacy and virtue may cure the leprosy, yet does not actually heal any man, but a leper who takes it; so the blood of Christ, which can heal any man, yet does not actually heal, or cleanse, or reconcile any man to God, but him who is contaminated with sin and believes. Therefore, they are by no means to be attended to who pretend that all men promiscuously are reconciled and placed in a state of grace by the passion of Christ itself, or who contend that all the elect, by the virtue alone of the same passion, have all their sins pardoned from eternity, since there is no pardon of sins but of those which are committed, nor any pardon of sins committed to be hoped for by any but by those who believe. Excellently and most truly says the Rev^d. Bishop of Salisbury,* of pious memory, (in Thoms. Diatr. cap. 2. p. 212,) *It ought*

* Robert Abbot, elder brother of the celebrated Archbishop. He emerged into notice by his talent in preaching; for which he became noted in the University of Oxford, not long after he took his orders in 1581, and which first obtained him preferment in Worcester, and in a short time the living of Bingham, in Notts, to which he was presented by John Stanhope, Esq. on hearing him at St. Paul's Cross. He soon became no less eminent on account of his writings, than he had been for his pulpit oratory; particularly against Dr. William Bishop, Popish Bishop of the ærial diocese of Calcedon, on the subject of the Sacrament. In 1597, he proceeded D.D., and soon after the accession of James I. that monarch appointed him one of his Chaplains in ordinary, and conceived so high an opinion of his writings, that he ordered his own Commentary upon part of the Apocalypse to be printed in 1608 with the second Edition of Abbot's book *De Antichristo.* In 1609, he was chosen Master of Baliol College, Oxford, at which he had matriculated, and which rose into distinction by his exertions. In 1610, he was nominated by the King one of the first fellows of the Royal College at Chelsea, then newly founded for the encouragement of Polemical Divinity; and, as Fuller in his Church History remarks, "engarrisoned with the ablest champions of the Protestant cause." Robert was, like his brother, a truly zealous opponent of Popery. This his subsequent appointment

not to be believed that remission of future sins is now made. For although indeed in the sight of God those things which he hath from all eternity ordered to be done, are as though they were now done, yet they are not otherwise to be received by us than according to that mode of dispensation by which his decrees from eternity are both accomplished to us in time and are actually brought to pass. Thus far this author. Remission of sins is not then to be dreamt of, nor reconciliation to be pretended except according to the manner of the dispensation decreed by God; that is, unless we first truly repent and believe in the Mediator.

ARGUMENT 4. The whole virtue and efficacy of that merit which Christ by his death procured for the benefit of the human race, as to its efflux and derivation to other persons, depends on the will of the Father in ordaining and accepting it. For who dare take to himself the merit of Christ in another way or on another condition than God himself hath ordained that it should be communicated

as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford afforded him public opportunities of evincing; and on this account mainly he was in 1615 selected by King James to fill the vacant See of Salisbury, as was declared by his Majesty on his being presented to do homage. He was consecrated by his own brother, who had been rapidly advanced from Lichfield to London, and to the Archiepiscopate of Canterbury about five years before; and it is worthy of remark, that this is the only instance of two brothers occupying the Episcopal bench in England, since the Reformation, to the time of the present excellent Bishops of Winchester and Chester. Robert filled his See little more than one year, dying in March, 1617, in the 58th year of his age; but universally lamented by the inhabitants of Salisbury, having endeared himself to them by every trait which could adorn the Episcopal office. The Bishop both in manners and talents was superior to the Archbishop, who was himself no common man. His published works were very popular in that age, but mostly controversial. The one referred to above was a reply to a work of Richard Thomson, whom there was occasion to notice at p. 448. The Bishop finished the book only the day before he died, and it was published by his Chaplain, the famous Dr. Featley, under the direction of the Archbishop; the full title running thus: *In Ricardi Thomsoni Angli-Belgici diatribam de amissione et intercessione justificationis et gratiæ, animadversio brevis.* Londini, 4to. 1618.—He left many things in MS. among which was a Latin Commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans, now in the Bodleian Library, left by its author in a state quite ready for publication. Were this work translated and given to the world, it would be an invaluable addition to that part of sacred theology.

to men and be accepted in their name? Truly, if any one should endeavour to do this, he would do it in vain. For the merit of Christ *is a benefit to us only as far as it was accepted by God,* as Scotus hath taught, not disagreeing with this our opinion (lib. 3, Dist. 19, Qu. vinc. p. 74.) But it was not accepted by God, that he should procure actual remission of sins and reconciliation for any mortal man before repentance, faith, and ingrafting into Christ. Therefore, he does not actually justify or reconcile to God any but those who repent and believe. But that it was not so accepted that he should reconcile any one before faith, appears from an argument derived from the Scriptures negatively in this manner: No word occurs in the holy Scriptures from which it can be collected that merely by the virtue and efficacy of the death of Christ all men are promiscuously restored to a state of grace, or that any man, whether elect or non-elect, before repentance and faith, obtains, by virtue of the blood of Christ shed on the cross, remission of sins, or actual reconciliation with God. Therefore it is rash to assert it. Neither is there any reason why a man should reject an argument of this kind derived from the authority of the Scriptures negatively. For although in lesser matters, which do not relate to the chief cause of our salvation, the reasoning would be weak—*This is not laid down in the Scriptures, therefore it is false or unlawful;* yet, in things necessary to be done or known in order to salvation, such as the manner of obtaining remission of sins and reconciliation with God, it justly follows, *This is not taught in the Scriptures, therefore it is not to be believed by us.* Since, therefore, the Scriptures no where teach that remission of sins or actual reconciliation were procured by the death of Christ for any individual before he repents and believes in Christ, it is not to be admitted under the pretext of amplifying the dignity of the death of Christ, or for any other reason. Now, having established this by a weight of arguments, we will also produce the sentiments of the Fathers, yet very few of them. Ambrose, on faith, (ad Gratian. lib. 4, cap. 1) says, *If thou dost not believe, he descended not for thee,*

he suffered not for thee. Which words have this meaning, That no benefit of redemption comes from the incarnation and passion of Christ to any individual, until he believes in Christ. For Ambrose would not deny that Christ descended and suffered for men, whether they believe or not; but he wishes to teach, that the benefit or saving virtue of this passion, quickens and reconciles men when they believe. Therefore in this form of speaking he follows the known rules of lawyers, who say, That *not to be, and to be uselessly, are to be reckoned as equal.* Those things which are found to be without effect, may be said *to stand for nothing.* Christ, therefore, is denied to have been incarnate and to have died for those who do not believe, because through their fault he is understood to have been incarnate and to have suffered uselessly and without effect. This plainly proves that, according to the opinion of Ambrose, for this reason alone, that Christ died for them that believe, no one is placed in a state of reconciliation and salvation before he possesses faith in the Gospel.

Augustine follows Ambrose and writes thus, (in Resp. ad artic. sibi falso impos. resp. 1) *Those who pass through this life without faith in Christ, and without the sacrament of regeneration, are strangers to redemption.* A little after, *The property of redemption belongs to those from whose hearts the prince of this world is driven away.* Further on he adds, *The passion or death of Christ has in itself what may be beneficial to all mankind, but if it is not internally received, it does not profit.* All which remarks express in other words the opinion of Ambrose, *If thou dost not believe, he descended not for thee, he suffered not for thee.* For the phrase, *they are strangers to redemption,* means nothing more than that those who have not yet believed, are not partakers of remission of sins and reconciliation with God. So also *the property of redemption* denotes the benefit of redemption acquired and as it were possessed, and declares that it belongs only to those who believe and are regenerate. And lastly, those words of Augustine, *if it is not internally received, it does not profit*, plainly evince that the benefit which redounds from the death of Christ is not derived to individuals, ex-

cept by *internally receiving*, that is, by believing. These things altogether and separately overturn the opinion of those who say, either that all men promiscuously, or the predestinated, as it were by a special privilege, are restored to a state of grace and actual reconciliation with God, for this reason alone, that Christ suffered on the cross for them.

Thirdly, Theodoret, writing on those words of the Apostle, Rom. iii. 25, *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*, &c. says, *The Lord Christ is the propitiation, and by his blood procured our salvation, requiring only faith from us.* From which words we collect, that Christ, with his death and all his merits, is so constituted the universal cause of our redemption, reconciliation, and salvation, that before the benefit of this redemption and salvation procured by Christ is partaken of by any one, it is necessary that this universal cause should be specially applied to each individual. Now that this beneficial application may be made, as Theodoret has well said, *God requires faith from us.* Therefore, while faith is absent, the death of Christ, considered in itself, brings no one into a state of actual reconciliation, of grace, and salvation. Cyril is found to be of the same opinion, when (lib. 2, cap. 74) explaining the words of our Saviour, John iii. 36, *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life*, he says thus, *Christ therefore quickens those who believe in him, because as there is a life according to nature, so he dwells in all the faithful by faith.* Therefore, although Christ is life itself, yet he does not quicken any but those who believe, which Cyril confirms by an excellent and forcible argument, namely, because he does not dwell in any but believers. As if he had said, The fountain of life does not actually quicken any but those who are united to him, and none but believers are considered to be united to him. Those therefore argue badly, who collect, whether from the death or from the life of Christ, either that all, or any, are placed in a state of life, grace, and salvation, before they are united to Christ by the bond of faith.

Lastly, The testimony of the venerable Bede is most express, in his Commentaries on 2 Cor. v. 19, *The world is reconciled to God by faith, when it believes in Christ, who was sent by God.* The Apostle had said, *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*, that is, that Christ by the ordination of God paid that ransom to the Father, by which it was effected that God should not demand satisfaction from us for our sins, before he returned into favour with us; but being content with this alone, is ready to receive any one into favour. If you enquire further, whether on the payment of this price all men are immediately reconciled by the act of payment? Bede answers, By no means; but every one is THEN *reconciled to God, when he believes in Christ, who was sent by God.* To the same effect are the words of the same author on Luke xv. *Then Christ is slain for every one of us, when we believe that he was slain. He was slain from the origin of the world in the Divine acceptation; he was slain also when the fulness of time came upon the cross. But he was slain for you and for me, that is, for every individual, when we believe in him that was slain.* Which is the same as if he had said, The benefit of the death of Christ belongs to us when we begin to believe in him. They have therefore departed from orthodox antiquity, who assert that all men are placed in a state of grace by the passion of Christ; nor less so they who teach that the predestinated, by this death of Christ, have obtained remission of their sins, or justification and reconciliation with God from eternity; since this justification or actual reconciliation (as Bernard truly and learnedly remarks) *cannot be without the consent of the receiver, any more than without the grace of the Giver.* And thus you have our opinion confirmed and strengthened. We shall now bring forward the objections of adversaries, and remove them in a few words.

In favour of the opinion of Huber,* who states that all

* Pro sententia Huberania, in the Original:—The Editor presumes that the author above referred to by Bishop Davenant is Samuel HUBER, who gave rise to a vehement controversy in the Lutheran Church, at the close of the sixteenth and in the early part of the seventeenth century. Walch,

men are restored to a state of grace and salvation, because Christ died for mankind, arguments of this kind are produced:

1. The death of Christ was either a sufficient ransom for blotting out the sins of the human race, and placing

in his Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta, Vol. II. pp. 645—648, has given an account of Huber's publications, and also of those by his antagonists; and from this accurate Ecclesiastical Biographer we learn that Huber held the following tenets:—

Deum omnes homines in Christo ad felicitatem sempiternam eligisse, nulla ratione habita fidei, sive ea præditi sint; sive minus; eo tamen modo, ut decreti hujus veluti mutatio fieret apud illos qui gratiam Divinam adspernarentur. Cum errore hoc alia prava dogmata conjunxit, præsertim de regeneratione ac justificatione, utramque esse universalem: omnesque mortales, pios atque impios, Turcas ac Christianos, propter universum Christi meritum ac per æquitatem, veniam peccatorum consequi posse. *Walch. Bibl. Theol. Sel.* Vol. II. p. 645.

On two former occasions (vide p. 366 and p. 448) Bishop Davenant has cited Puccius in conjunction with Huber. Puccius (Francesco Pucci or Franciscus Puccius) was descended from an antient Florentine family, and was early distinguished for his love of study. From Lyons, whither he had gone with the design of entering into commerce, and where he cultivated the Society of Literary men, he came into England, and went to Oxford, where he studied Theology, and took the degree of M.A. in 1574. His opposition to the Calvinist party (which at that time was dominant in the University), in his Treatise *De Fide in Deum, quæ et qualis sit*, procured him many enemies, and finally lost him a Professor's Chair. He then withdrew to Bâsle, where he became acquainted with Faustus Socinus, to whose opinions he was favourable. The Divines of Bâsle forced him to quit that city on account of his opinions respecting universal grace, which he proposed in his Thesis entitled—*Universum genus humanum in ipso utero efficaciter particeps esse beneficiorum Christi et vitæ immortalis et beatæ*, &c. Pucci expected to find more toleration at London; but scarcely had he arrived there when his extravagant opinions caused him to be thrown into prison. On being liberated he fled into Holland, and corresponded with Faustus Socinus, whom however he opposed, on certain points, in his treatise *De Immortalitate naturali primi hominis ante peccatum.* After wandering about to various places, in 1595 he held some conferences with the Papal Nuncio then at Prague, and returned to the Romish Church. Some years before, he had dedicated to Pope Clement VIII. a Treatise entitled *De Christi Salvatoris Efficacitate omnibus et singulis hominibus, quatenus homines sunt, Assertio Catholica*, &c. Pucci was subsequently ordained a Priest in the Romish Church, and became Secretary to Cardinal Pompey d'Aragon, in whose house he died in 1600. (*Biographie Universelle.* Tom. XXXVI. pp. 281, 282.)

all men in a state of grace and reconciliation; or was insufficient. If it is stated to be insufficient, we extenuate Divine grace, and unworthily trample upon the merit of Christ. If it is acknowledged to be sufficient, then the cause being placed in a sufficient act, nothing else is required to produce the effect. Therefore, from the act of Christ offering up himself to God, immediately follows the universal deliverance of all men from the guilt of their sins, and the universal reconciliation or reception of all men into the Divine favour.

Reply. We acknowledge the most full sufficiency of the ransom; yea, its infinite superabundance. But we answer, That this merit of Christ, considered in itself, operates indeed sufficiently as an universal cause of the salvation of mankind; but an universal cause does not produce effects in individuals before there is an individual application. Therefore as Aquinas says (Part. 3, qu. 49, art. 10, & qu. disp. de grat. Chr. art. 7,) *By the death of Christ was made a most sufficient universal cause, by means of which all the sins of any person whatever may be expiated; but before this cause manifests its expiatory virtue for the deliverance and reconciliation of individuals, it is needful that it should be applied to individuals by faith.* Which the Apostle himself hath perspicuously taught, Rom. iii. 25, *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood,* &c. Therefore, although this death of Christ is a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of the human race, yet, since it cleanses us from our sins after the manner of a medicine, it must be applied to each person before it can produce the effect of reconciliation and health. But the application is made only by faith.

2. If God should not receive all men into favour after having accepted a sufficient ransom, it would be an act of injustice to Christ, because he does not bestow upon men what Christ by dying merited for them: He would also act unjustly towards men, because he still holds them bound by their sins, as by debts, when Christ hath blotted out all their debts with his blood.

Reply. Injustice is not done to either. Not to Christ,

because he would not that the satisfaction made by him for the sins of the human race, should avail to the actual reconciliation of individuals, without the intervention of their faith, as it was proved before. It would therefore be reproachful to Christ, if any one should be admitted into the fellowship and actual participation of this grace, who does not believe in Jesus Christ the Author of salvation, and our Redeemer. Nor is injustice done to men, that they are not immediately received into the favour of God on account of the act of Christ in dying, because this was neither due nor promised to mankind. For we cannot claim for ourselves any benefit from the death of Christ contrary to and in addition to the order and covenant made by God and Christ, and laid open to us in the Gospel. Now this is the established order, this condition is expressly stated in the Gospel; that the grace of reconciliation and the benefit of eternal life should redound to sinners from the death of Christ, if they should believe: But if not, they should remain under the guilt of their sins, and should perish in their unbelief. *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* (John iii. 36.)

Objection 3. There was not greater force in the sin of Adam to bind all men under the penalty of eternal death, than in the death and merit of Christ to absolve all men, to reconcile them to God, and to restore them to a state of grace and salvation. Thus the act of Adam binds all men under the guilt of sin, and subjects them to Divine wrath: Therefore, the act of Christ dying ought to deliver all men from death, to reconcile them to God, and to place them in a state of grace and salvation.

Reply. In this argument is involved a false supposition. In the major proposition it is as it were taken for granted, that the efficacy or virtue of any cause is always to be estimated greater or less according as it extends itself to more or fewer subjects; which is very false. For the efficacy or excellence of a cause is to be estimated from the nature and excellency of its effects rather than from

their multitude. For instance; It is a proof of greater virtue and excellence to restore sight to one blind man than to put out the eyes of a thousand men; to heal one maimed and diseased man, than to mutilate or poison a thousand whole and healthy men; in a word, to recal one man to life, than to put a thousand to death. For a like reason, the power of Christ by his death is greater and more efficacious in the salvation of only one man, than that of Adam in destroying by his sin the whole human race. To the minor proposition it may also be answered, That the act of the sin of Adam does not bind any man under the penalty of death, or render him obnoxious to the wrath of God, unless from hence, that he was propagated from sinful Adam by natural generation. And in the same manner evidently the act of the death of Christ does not deliver any man from a state of death or from Divine wrath, any further than he is derived from Christ by a supernatural regeneration. Therefore the condition is equal on both sides, if a just comparison be made. All who are naturally descended from Adam have lost the grace of God and eternal life. All who are supernaturally regenerated by Christ recover the grace of God and eternal life. No man is subjected to death or Divine wrath by the fault of the sin of Adam, unless he has derived a natural origin from him. No man is delivered from death or Divine wrath through the merit of the death of Christ, unless he has derived from him a heavenly birth. This is wisely and learnedly explained by Aquinas (Contra Gentil. lib. 4, cap. 55,) where he has these words, *The effect of the sin of our first parent cleaves to every one by his fleshly origin; so the effect of the death of Christ pertains to every one by spiritual regeneration. He who desires that the merit of Christ may be beneficial to him, seeks to be regenerated by the Spirit of Christ.* If any one should still urge, That to be propagated from Adam, whence wrath and the penalty of death follows, is common to all men; why is it not in the same manner stated, that to be regenerated by Christ, on which depends our reconciliation and salvation, is common to all men? To this I shall merely answer, That God himself was un-

willing that those things which flow to men in the way of grace, should be as common to all as those things which are derived to men in the way of nature. He willed that his grace should make men differ from each other, and therefore he would not make it equally common to all men. Augustine has noticed this (De Prædest. Sanct. cap. 5), which consult at your leisure. Let no one then murmur against God, because by the operation of his special grace he regenerates some, and unites them to Christ by faith; let no one enquire why he delivers one man rather than another: since this answer of God himself is sufficient to stop the mouth of any, (Matt. xx. 15) *Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?* &c. And that of the Apostle, (Rom. ix. 18) *He hath mercy on whom he will.* See also Augustine (De bono persev. cap. 8.) Therefore, although as to its sufficiency, the death of Christ has regard equally to all men; yet as to its efficacy, it depends on the Divine election, that the effects of the merits of Christ are mercifully applied to any, while, through the impediment of their own unbelief, they are not applied to others.

Hitherto we have answered those who contend for the universal and actual reconciliation of all men individually: Now let us hear what may be brought forward by those who assert that the elect are, by the efficacy of the death of Christ, justified and reconciled to God from eternity.

Objection 1. Those who assert that God is only placable and reconcileable to the elect, and not actually reconciled and pacified before their faith and repentance, seem to place acts and powers in God, and to admit that God can be what he is not: But God is a pure act and altogether immutable: Therefore it is impossible that he should now be what he was not before: If then he is reconciled to Peter or Paul, after they are known to repent and believe, he was also reconciled to them from eternity. For it may seem to be granted of itself, that any change in God, who is a most pure act, and in every way most simple, is a variation. But that this is most foreign from the

Divine nature, which is free from all kinds of mutability, no one in his senses will deny: especially since it seems not only consonant to the dictates of right reason, and agreeable to the decrees of the sounder philosophy, which teaches *that the same by the same always does the same*, that is, that the same thing being done in the same way always produces the same effect; but also may be confirmed and established by not a few, and those most beautiful passages of the holy Scriptures, as from that testimony of the prophet Malachi (iii. 6,) *For I am the Lord, I change not*; according to Junius, *I, Jehovah, change not.* Also of Numbers xxiii. 19, *God is not a man, that he should lie; nor the son of man, that he should change.* A passage plainly like to this is brought from the epistle of the Apostle St. James (i. 17), *Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.* There is so far from being any change in God, that in him there is not even the least shadow of turning. But if it could be affirmed of God, that at one time he is placable, at another time pacified; at one time only reconcileable, at another reconciled, it might truly be doubted, and not improperly, whether God is always like himself, and always is disposed evidently in the same manner. For placability seems to intimate only some previous disposition and inclination to future pacification and reconcileability, a facility and propensity in God to reconciliation, which is brought into action towards believing men from his power.

Reply. That God is reconcileable to any elect person before his faith and repentance, and is actually reconciled to him after his faith and repentance, does not more argue a change in God from act to power, than this man's not being justified until he believes and his being actually justified after he believes, argues a changeableness in God; or than his sins being remissible, and after his repentance being actually forgiven, proves a temporary change of the Divine essence or will from power to act. For no man could truly say, because Paul was justified when he believed in Christ, but was not justified while he was a blas-

phemer against Christ, that therefore a change took place in God; therefore, neither because at one time he was reconcileable to God, at another time actually reconciled: since to be justified and to be reconciled to God are altogether the same, or at least are inseparably connected. But that we may remove this scruple more clearly, we must observe, that although nothing absolute can anew be added to God without his changing, yet infinite relative denominations may anew, and according to difference of time, at one time be predicated of God, and at another time not be predicated of him; the Divine essence and will all the while remaining without any shadow of turning. For those things of a mutable and temporary kind which are affirmed of God, are not so affirmed on account of any change taking place in God, but according to the change which happens to the creature. For instance, It may be truly said, *That Adam was creatable by God,* when it could not be truly said, *That Adam was created by God.* In like manner, *Adam is justifiable before God,* or *Adam is reconcileable to God,* might be said before his actual repentance, when it could not be said, *Adam is actually justified and reconciled to God.* Notwithstanding we do not apply to God acts and powers, or any kind of mutability; because these things are spoken of God in a different way, not of any change which takes place in himself, but of the change of a creature, which is from him. For as Albertus learnedly remarks, (Tract. 4. qu. 21, de Immutab. Dei.) *In those things which are done essentially, he acts in one way, and it is not said, that he acts now and not before, except so far as he has acted now and not before.* Nor do we think that there is any new or temporary act in the will of God, when we state that he is actually reconciled to any man on believing, to whom before believing he was only reconcileable; because God does not then begin to will that this believer should be actually reconciled to him, who before he had faith was reconcileable, but from all eternity willed that at that moment he should both believe and be actually reconciled. In the Willer, then, there are not successive changes, but

in the thing willed, and those changes are according to one eternal and most unchangeable will of God.

Objection 2. God is actually reconciled to him whom he actually loves, But he loves all the elect from eternity; Therefore he is actually reconciled to them from eternity: Therefore they are also actually reconciled and justified from eternity.

Reply. A distinction is to be made with Aquinas, that God is said to love in a twofold manner; *according to his purpose of communicating his goodness, and according to the act of communication.* (In 3, Sent. dist. 19.) The love according to his eternal purpose, which Divines call *The love of eternal benevolence,* does not make him who is loved in this manner to be esteemed by God as actually justified or actually reconciled; but that he should be reckoned among those who are infallibly to be justified and reconciled. There is, therefore, a different kind of words which denote acts inherent in God and acts which flow from God to us. The former, such as *love, election, predestination,* are eternal and internal acts of God himself, and from them men are called *beloved, elect, predestinated,* on account of the secret good pleasure of the Divine will conceived and hidden in himself. The latter, such as *calling, justification, reconciliation, glorification,* are external acts, which terminate in the creature in whom they exist, and are as it were received by him; and from these no one is properly said to be *called, justified, reconciled, glorified,* solely from the secret and eternal purpose of the Divine will, but from the covenanted performance of the same purpose, and from the effect being produced in men. We confess, therefore, the eternal will in God of justifying and reconciling to himself all the elect; but we deny that they ought to be said to have been justified or reconciled from eternity: In the same manner as we acknowledge that there was in God an eternal will of creating the world, and yet we deny that the world was created from eternity. What Zanchius says of the actual remission of sins, we say of the actual reconciliation of the elect, (Thomson. Diatr. p. 96) *It is in-*

deed most certain in the Divine predestination from eternity; but it is not actually given on the part of God, nor actually received on the part of man, until he repents and believes.

OBJECTION 3. The efficacy itself of the means in some men rather than in others, arises not from the difference of free-will, but from hence, that God was reconciled to all the elect in Christ before the foundation of the world, but to others he was not reconciled: Therefore, we ought not to deny that all the elect are actually reconciled to God before their conversion and faith, since that dispensation derives its origin and the efficacy of the means to produce in them faith and repentance, from their eternal and antecedent reconciliation.

REPLY. We willingly grant that the infallible efficacy of the means ordained to salvation does not depend upon the human will, but upon the eternal and special love of God towards his own elect. But we assert that this love does not regard those who are as yet unbelieving and unconverted, otherwise than as a gratuitous purpose of providing for them, that hereafter they should be converted, and justified, and reconciled to God, and infallibly brought to eternal life. It is, therefore, equally false to infer eternal justification, and the eternal reconciliation of the elect, and their eternal glorification from this eternal love; since from thence ought to be collected only their certain and infallible justification, reconciliation, and glorification; which certainty or infallible efficacy of means tending to salvation, arises from the aforesaid love of God, and not by virtue of free-will. If any one pleases to call this love, on which depends the certainty of conversion and reconciliation to be produced in time, actual reconciliation, since God himself *calleth those things which be not as though they were,* (Rom. iv. 17) I find no fault, provided he allows at the same time that he calls the purpose of the thing to be done by the name of the thing done; because, as Augustine says, *It was fixed in the predestination of God that it should take place in his own time.* (De Civit. Dei, lib. 12, cap. 16.)

OBJECTION 4. Some passages may be produced from the Scriptures which seem to assert, as to the elect, actual and eternal reconciliation with God before their faith and repentance. Ephes. i. 4, God is said to have *chosen them before the foundation of the world,* and ver. 6, to *have made them accepted in his beloved Son.* They were therefore elected, and actually justified and reconciled, from eternity; for although their reconciliation was made on the part of God when they believed the Gospel, yet that rather then began to be manifested and revealed which had been done from the foundation of the world.

REPLY. It is one thing to choose a person to life before the formation of the world, another thing actually to justify and reconcile him to himself before the formation of the world. Election bespeaks in God an eternal will of justifying, reconciling, and saving the person elected; but of justifying, reconciling, and saving him in his own time by faith. Therefore, the actual justification, reconciliation, and sanctification of the person elected, flows from eternal election, but is not co-eternal with it. It is easy to collect this from the whole discourse of St. Paul in the first chapter to the Ephesians. He affirms (ver. 4) that we were *chosen before the foundation of the world,* but he does not therefore say, that we were sanctified before the foundation of the world, but, that we were *chosen that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.* Nor does he teach us, that by virtue of eternal election we were justified or reconciled from eternity, but *in the dispensation of the fulness of times,* (ver. 9, 10, &c.) after having *first trusted in Christ,* and believed the Gospel which was made known to us. Nor are the words, *He hath made us accepted in his beloved Son,* opposed to this idea; for the Greek word εχαριτωσεν seems to refer rather to the present state of the elect now regenerate, than to the eternal purpose of God. From whence Beza translates it, *Freely he made them acceptable to himself,* namely, he freely justified them and admitted them on believing into a state of actual reconciliation. But if any one interprets that *acceptance* as relating to the eternal love of God, by which he embraces the elect before

they were born, that acceptance will denote the *purpose* of communicating his goodness, not the *act* of communication itself, as was mentioned before from Aquinas. Beza also, in his Commentaries on the 5th verse, has rightly observed, That the elect *in due time receive wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption freely by faith;* therefore they are not from eternity justified, sanctified, or reconciled, although elected and predestinated from eternity. But no one hath taught this more plainly than the Apostle himself, who demonstrates that the same persons whom he said were *chosen before the foundation of the world,* yet *were by nature the children of wrath* (Ephes. ii. 3), and long remained *without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who formerly were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ,* when, through the blood of Christ received by faith, they were reconciled to God (ver. 12, 13, &c.) If, therefore, we believe St. Paul, although the election and predestination of mankind proceeds from the eternal love of God, yet it is not to be said, that their eternal justification and reconciliation are manifested and revealed when they believe in Christ, but that they then first take place.

Again; The Apostle says (2 Tim. i. 9, 10), That *grace was given to the elect in Christ Jesus, before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ.* But God evidently appears to be reconciled to them, before the world began, to whom he then gave grace in Christ.

Reply. On account of the unchangeableness and immoveableness of the Divine purpose, that grace is said to be given to the elect before the world began, which was then destined for them. In this passage, therefore, *eternal giving* is eternal preparation of grace infallibly to *be given* to the elect in due time. Thus Augustine observes, *The Apostle says that grace was given when there were not as yet persons to whom it should be given, because in the disposition and predestination of God, that was now done which was to be done in his own time.* (De doctr. Christ. lib. 3, cap. 34.)

Thus Junius remarks on these words, *He says that the grace was given from eternity, to which we were predestinated from eternity.* Nor has Calvin otherwise expounded them ; *This gift of grace,* says he, *of which the Apostle makes mention, is nothing else than predestination, by which we are adopted among the sons of God.* A little after, *He gave that which, without being induced by merit, he assigned to those who were not yet born, and he had it laid up in his treasures, until he should really manifest that he had appointed nothing in vain.* Therefore we rightly deduce from hence, that the grace of justification, reconciliation, and salvation were actually assigned from eternity to all the elect, and, as it were, laid up and reserved for them in the treasury of the Divine love ; but it is not rightly deduced that they were actually conferred upon them before faith and conversion. The justification and reconciliation of the elect is not said to be opened and manifested when they believe in Christ, but then given and conferred. But what is said to be then revealed and manifested, is the eternal good pleasure or purpose of God concerning the salvation of the elect; which he makes known to us when, the Spirit and faith having been given, we obtain justification and reconciliation with God.

There are some other passages brought forward to prove that our reconciliation with God is not effected at the time when we embrace the Mediator by faith, but that all the elect were reconciled to God from eternity. Of this kind are Rom. v. 10, *When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* Ephes. ii. 4, 5, *For his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ.* And Coloss. i. 21, 22, *And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death,* &c. From these passages it appears that reconciliation does not follow the act of faith, but that God is reconciled to his own, even when they are unbelievers and enemies to God. For it is not a proof of God being placable and reconcileable, but of his being pacified and actually reconciled, when such benefits are conferred upon men.

Reply. If by *reconciliation* nothing else is meant than the inclination and propensity of the Divine will to grant remission, and make peace with all who shall embrace the Redeemer by faith, we grant that God is reconciled to the whole human race, by virtue of the death of Christ, even while we continue enemies to him. But herein (as was stated before) a step is taken towards our actual and personal reconciliation, rather than the actual reconciliation of individuals is effected. Moreover, if by *reconciliation* we understand the eternal election of God, according to which he hath determined to call, justify, reconcile to himself, and save certain individuals in time, you cannot by this means make it out that God can in this sense be said to be benevolent to all the elect, even when they are living in impiety and unbelief. But this benevolence which precedes faith inspired into the hearts of the elect, contains only a purpose of making peace with them, and does not place them in a state of peace obtained and of actual reconciliation. These things being premised, I reply, that all these passages speak either of the step towards personal reconciliation, or of the elect believing and being placed in a state of actual reconciliation; which cannot take place without the intervention of faith. They therefore confirm our opinion, rather than the opposite. For that which is said Rom. v. 10, *When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*, &c. has no other sense than that men, from a state of enmity, are transferred into a state of actual reconciliation with God, through the death of Christ, as soon as they believe in Christ. This is plain, because the Apostle, verse 1 of this chapter, restrains this *peace* or reconciliation to those only who are *justified by faith;* and verse 11 he speaks of the same actual reconciliation as being just made, *By whom we have now received the atonement*, (margin) *or reconciliation*, that is, now, after we have believed in Christ. With respect to the second passage, Ephes. ii. 4, 5, it is most true, that *God, when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ*, but as he hath not actually quickened any unless by faith previously inspired, so neither hath he reconciled them;

for *to be reconciled to God* is to be delivered from the guilt of death, to be placed in a state of spiritual life, and to be presented with an hereditary right to eternal life; which things do not belong to the elect merely because they are elected, but when they have been effectually called and converted to God. The Apostle himself has taught this in verse 8, *By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.* The last passage taken from Coloss. i. 21, 22, plainly confirms our opinion, namely, that mankind are not at once justified and reconciled to God, either by God's eternal act of predestination, or by the merit of the death of Christ for his own elect. For what else do these words mean at first sight, *You, that were formerly alienated,* &c. *yet now hath he reconciled,* than that we then at length obtain, through the blood of Christ, remission of sins and actual reconciliation with God, when, being united to Christ by faith, we are admitted into an actual participation and possession of his merits and righteousness. It is unnecessary to add more for the explanation of this proposition. From what has been said, it may sufficiently appear, that those persons extend the universal efficacy of the death of Christ beyond its just limits, who think that by the mere act of the death of Christ all mankind promiscuously are restored to a state of grace; nor do they do less, who contend that all the predestinated, on account of the merit of Christ, are justified from eternity, and actually reconciled to God, even before they have believed the Gospel.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LAST PROPOSITION STATED AND CONFIRMED.

WE have exhibited the universal virtue and efficacy of the death of Christ, explained in three propositions. In the *first* it was demonstrated, That this death of Christ was appointed by God and proposed to the human race, as an universal remedy applicable to all men individually. In the *second*, we have shewn in what sense Christ is said to have died for all, or in what sense the death of Christ may be acknowledged to have been established as an universal cause of salvation, for the good of the whole human race; namely, not as some assert, by reason of its mere sufficiency, or intrinsic value, in which respect the death of Christ, or the blood of the Son of God, is a price more than sufficient to redeem each and all men and angels; but by reason of the Evangelical covenant established and confirmed by this death and blood of Christ, according to the tenor of which covenant a right accrued to all men individually, on condition of faith, of claiming for themselves remission of sins and eternal life. To these two propositions we have subjoined a *third*, in which it was shewn, That the universal virtue of the death of Christ having been stated, and the universal covenant of the Gospel having regard to every man, yet that every individual person has indeed, by the sole benefit of this death, God under obligation to enter into peace with him, and give him life, if he should believe; but has not actual justification or reconciliation, or an actual state of grace and salvation, before he believes.

There now remains a *fourth* and last proposition, which may serve chiefly for removing any scruple from the minds

of those who extend this universal efficacy of the death of Christ which we defend, further than the truth of the thing permits. For there are some who, because the death of Christ, in the sense aforesaid, is affirmed to have been imposed for the human race, for themselves and all mankind individually, immediately infer, that it is now incumbent on the Divine justice and goodness, that he should administer the means necessary for producing faith to all for whom he thus gave Christ to death. But because it appears more clearly than mid-day light, that to heathens and pagans, upon whom the light of the Gospel never shone, means were not given which immediately suffice to produce faith in them, they resort to an assertion, that sufficient means were always given even to such persons, by which they might be led mediately, and, as it were, by degrees, to faith in Christ, if they had made proper use of them. But if any one should inquire what those means of grace are, which are obvious to all men, and are sufficiently able to lead all men to the faith of Christ, they bring before us Nature clothed with the name of Grace. For they say that there are certain remains of spiritual life in all men, namely, in the understanding, some knowledge of God, in the affections, some desire after the knowledge of what is good; of which natural endowments if a man makes a right use, God will give him more grace, and present him with saving faith. Aquinas seems to lean to this opinion (Quæst. 14, De veritate, art. 11, Resp. ad. 1,) where he writes in this manner, *If a man brought up in the woods should follow the dictate of natural reason in the desire of good and the avoiding of evil, it is most certainly to be believed that God will either reveal to him by internal inspiration those things which are necessary to be believed, or will direct to him some preacher of the faith.* The opinion, therefore, of those persons amounts to this, that they think that God, by the efficacy and merit of the death of Christ, is now bound, as it were by a statute law, to supply sufficient means to all, by which they may be led to Christ, if they should be willing; so that on the part of God nothing is wanting that they should not obtain faith and a benefi-

cial participation of the death of Christ. For the solution of this difficulty we have brought forward this proposition to be explained and confirmed, viz.

THESIS 4. *The death of Christ being granted to be applicable to all men on condition of faith, it is consistent with the goodness and justice of God to supply or to deny, either to nations or to individuals, the means of application, and that according to the good pleasure of his own will, not according to the disparity of human wills.* I shall premise a few things, and then proceed to confirm the proposition. *First,* then, it is to be observed, that those who are of a contrary opinion think (Adver. Tilen. Corv. p. 403, and 109, 121, 158, 119), *That God is bound as it were by a fixed decree, and appointed law, to grant the talent of grace to those who rightly use the talent of nature.* Secondly, they presume, *That every pagan, although dwelling in the shadow of death, is able, by his own free will, to use this natural talent well or ill.* Thirdly, From this distinction, whether right or wrong, of those who use their natural gifts, they endeavour to give a reason why God should deign to enlighten some with the Gospel and the knowledge of Christ, and not others. They affirm, *If any one rightly uses those gifts, he will be led by degrees to a saving knowledge of Christ; but if he wickedly abuses them, he is deservedly deprived of the knowledge of Christ.* Augustine seems to have been of a different opinion (Libro de Nat. & Grat. cap. 8 and 9) where he grants, *that the means of salvation cannot be applied to some infants,* where also he acknowledges, *that adults who have died in that region where they could not hear of the name of Christ, could by no means become righteous by nature and free-will.* We also affirm that there is no decree, no law, or promise of God extant, according to which any one can certainly conclude, This man has used the light of nature rightly or less badly, therefore God will illuminate him with supernatural grace. Arminius indeed says (Vide Armin. contra Perk. p. 218,) *that God has promised this in that saying of Christ,* TO HIM THAT HATH SHALL BE GIVEN. But much more truly and learnedly the Reverend Bishop of Salisbury

(De vera Grat. Chr. p. 68) says, *Arminius here commits a fallacy, in promising to him that hath in a state of nature, a gift for salvation in a state of grace, and makes the light of faith the reward of diligence in unbelievers. For in whatever thing, and of whatever kind, good use is made, in the same thing he also promises increase.* Alvarez, a Papist, informs us on this subject (De Auxil. disp. 56, p. 651), *No law was ever made for giving the helps of grace to those who do all that is in their power from the faculty of nature, neither did Christ the Lord by his death merit, or desire to merit, such a law.* The Apostle Paul teaches that the dispensation of supernatural grace proceeds, not according to the use and works of the will of man, but according to the purpose and counsel of the will of God: *He worketh all things according to the purpose and counsel of his own will* (Eph. i. 11.)

Secondly, although we acknowledge that some sparks of natural light remain in heathens, and some imperfect desire of moral good, yet, as the same Bishop of Salisbury whom we have before commended, excellently says, (pp. 66, 67) *Because those deformed ruins have no inhabitant but the devil, there cannot be any other than a corrupt use, in the midst of the corruption of these remains.* Let the adversaries shew to us even one man from the beginning of the world, who from the good use of nature derived to himself the gift of grace. It is impossible (morally speaking) that a heathen in a state of corrupt nature, should not place very many obstacles to Divine grace, so far is he from well using his natural powers, so that he may obtain for himself gratuitous and supernatural aid. Aquinas truly says, (Contr. Gent. lib. 3, p. 160) *If through preceding disorder free-will should decline to evil, it will not be at all in his power to offer no impediment to grace.* Therefore, they who think that Evangelical grace is given to all those who make a right use of the light of nature, and do not oppose an impediment to grace, dream that there are such men in a state of corrupt nature, as it is not credible there ever were, or are, or will be. *For whatever may be called an impediment, no one can remove this impediment but God,* as Bradwardine truly

teaches (De causa Dei, contra. Pelag. lib. 2, cap. 32*). Thirdly, and lastly, we assert, on the testimony of the holy Scripture and of experience, that the Gospel and other means of salvation, were not granted or denied to men for this reason, because some made a right use of the light of nature, or at least made a less evil use of it, and others perversely and wickedly abused it. For it appears from the sacred Scriptures, that the light of the Gospel shone on those thoughtless persons who in the worst manner abused their natural light or talent. Such were the Romans, Corinthians, (1 Cor. vi. 11) Ephesians, (Eph. ii. 8, 21) among whom the torch of the Gospel was lighted up by the Apostles, when they were voluntarily living in

* BRADWARDINE (Thomas) a learned English Divine of the 14th Century. He was born at Hartfield, in Sussex, and educated at Merton College, Oxford, where he took the degree of D.D. and became Proctor and Divinity Professor of the University, and after being appointed Chancellor of the Diocese of London, attended Edward III. as his Confessor during his wars in France. Whilst so situated, a vacancy occurred in the See of Canterbury, and the Monks elected him Archbishop; but Edward, who was fond of his company, refused to part with him. Another vacancy happening soon after, the Monks elected him a second time, and Edward yielded to their desires, and Bradwardine was consecrated Archbishop in 1349; but he died 40 days after his consecration at Lambeth, and was buried at Canterbury. He excelled in Mathematical knowledge, and wrote several treatises on that science which have been published; among them is one on the quadrature of the circle. He was most distinguished, however, for his accurate and solid investigations in Divinity; and is best known as the author of a book against Pelagianism, entitled *De Causa Dei*. The reader unacquainted with it, but desirous of knowing something of the contents of a thick and closely printed Latin folio, or of the nature of a work as profound in argument as it is elaborate in illustration, may consult Milner, who, in Vol. IV. of his Church History, has given a good account of it. The original itself is well worthy of examination, if it were only to convince some of the would-be-thought theologians of our time, that humility and reserve would become them better than a jejune expression of opinions on subjects which have so occupied men of gigantic minds; and to display to others the deep piety and ardent devotion which existed with solid learning, extensive acquirements, and a lofty genius. The fame of this work, it is said, led Chaucer, in his "Nuns' Priests' tale," to rank Bradwardine with St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. An Apologue in this treatise appears to have furnished Parnell with the story of his beautiful Poem "The Hermit."—The best Edition is that by Sir Henry Saville, printed at London, in 1618.

the filth of superstition and lusts. It is also not less manifest, to how many the Gospel was never revealed, who lived less wickedly. Who is ignorant that among the philosophers, Socrates, Plato, Xenophon; and among the Romans, Fabricius, Scipio, Cato, made a good use of the light of nature beyond other men? yet none of these on that account became a partaker of the grace of the Gospel. Therefore the reason of the Gospel and supernatural light being given or denied, is not to be sought in the better or worse use of the light of nature, but in the good pleasure of God, who calls or not as it pleases him. These things being disposed of, let us proceed to the proposition itself: which we confirm, in the first place, by an argument derived from the death of Christ, from whence our adversaries think that they can infer the contrary.

ARGUMENT I. If by the death of Christ a covenant was established, according to which remission of sins is promised to every one that believeth, but no covenant was established according to which the Gospel is promised to any heathen who uses his natural endowments rightly, or no ways badly, then, the death of Christ being admitted, it is rash to conclude that God is bound by his faithfulness, or goodness, or justice, or any other covenant, to reveal to men the mystery of the grace of the Gospel on account of a better use of nature. But it is most certain, that such a covenant no where exists. Therefore a revelation, or a denial of the Gospel, depends on the good pleasure of God, who withholds or reveals it as it seems good to himself, and not on account of the different kinds of actions of men. We prove the major thus: that God is bound to no man, and owes no man any thing, except of his own gratuitous and voluntary promise. *Who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?* (Rom. xi. 35.) Upon which sentence Augustine says (in Psalm lxxxiii.), *The Lord makes himself a debtor not by receiving, but by promising;* he hath not promised any thing spiritual to the works of corrupt nature however splendid they may be. He hath not made any law by which he may be restrained from giving spiritual blessings to men how-

ever wicked, and covered with all kind of iniquities. We ought not, therefore, to give a reason, from the difference of men or their works, why the Gospel and the knowledge of Christ is obtained by some and not by others; but to acquiesce in the good pleasure of the Divine will; according to the Apostle, (2 Tim. i. 9) *He hath called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began.* But still it may be pretended, Although God is not bound either by debt, or by any promise confirmed by the death of Christ, to reveal Christ to them that make a good use of the light of nature, yet since of his grace he is accustomed to give to men many things which he had not promised; what should hinder us from saying that he has this as his common way of distributing the grace of the Gospel, that he grants it to those who make a better use of the light of nature, and does not grant it to those who, by abusing the light of nature more than others, render themselves more unworthy of the light of grace? One impediment is, that by this we do not admit the perpetual testimony of Scripture to the contrary, which refers the communication of saving grace, not to the man who works better, but to God, who loves and pities one more than another. (Rom. ix. 18.) Another impediment is, experience itself. For it often happens, *that a man from his infancy is very modest, temperate, and a victor over his passions for the most part, and lives and dies in a place where the Gospel of Christ cannot by any means be preached to him: But another, enslaved to lust, and covered with wickedness, is so overruled by God, that he hears, believes, and is saved.* We say then that all men, from their bad use of nature, render themselves unworthy of the Gospel; and that God, in communicating or denying the Gospel, is not accustomed to weigh the degrees of human worthiness and unworthiness, and from thence to derive his common rule of bestowing or not bestowing grace; but sometimes denies it to those who have not made good use of the remains of nature, and in the mean time grants it to those who have abused them much worse: and sometimes does the con-

trary. From whence it appears That the reason of the difference why God grants his grace to one and not to another, ought to be referred to the good pleasure of God himself, and not to the different kind of operations of men.

ARGUMENT 2. Secondly, we prove, that it is not contrary to the Divine goodness, even admitting the death of Christ, still not to grant the means of application to all men whatsoever according to his good pleasure: because the death of Christ is a benefit granted freely by God himself to the human race. But it is just and right that the free application of his own benefit should be in the power of the Benefactor, who is never bound by the giving of one benefit to the giving of another, unless he should have made such a promise; which promise of granting the means by which the death of Christ may be applied, neither can all men promiscuously, nor any person for himself individually, rightly assert was made. Moreover, it is no reflection on the Divine goodness not to grant any benefit to one, if he does not bring an injury upon any one, or unjustly deny to or deprive any one of a benefit due to him; but illumination by the grace of the Gospel, the death of Christ being supposed, yet is not due to nature, now corrupted by sin. Thus Bannes says (In. 1, qu. 23, art. 3, p. 279,) *The same argument is not applicable to natural and supernatural illumination, because that which is natural is due to nature, but the illumination of grace is not due to nature, especially as it is so corrupted by sin, but is conferred by grace.* If it is conferred by grace, then it is not due to all. For among the twelve articles which pertain to the Christian faith, Augustine has put this second (Epist. 107), *The grace of God is not given to all men.* If it is conferred of grace, then it is not given or denied according to the good or bad use of natural light; for, as Prosper rightly remarks, (Resp. 8, ad Capit. Gallor.) *It is impiety to affirm that the grace by which we are saved is either given in payment for meritorious deeds or restrained by evil ones.* And, (De Vocat. Gent.) *There are no wickednesses so detestable as to drive away the gift of grace.* Those therefore who are desirous of defending the justice and good-

ness of God by human conjectures, contend that he supplies the gratuitous means of salvation to all who make use of their natural endowments either aright or not badly, but denies them to others who have abused the same gifts, (as Augustine says) *being ignorant of the height and depth of Divine grace, form improbable fables.* Whether, therefore, we will or not, if the cause is sought Why those means, by which they may apply Christ to themselves for salvation, are granted to some individuals, and not to others, we must overlook the disparity of men, or of human works, and ascend to the free good pleasure of God, as Prosper elegantly observes, (Carmine. de Ingratis. cap. 35) *Since the same cause equally implicates all, they are not to be distinguished by merit, who are far from possessing the gift.*

ARGUMENT 3. From the fact we argue thus as to the right; God does not omit to do any thing, which it would be an impeachment upon Divine goodness, justice, or wisdom not to do. This cannot be doubted, since it is impossible that he who is Goodness, Justice, and Wisdom itself, could ever depart from the rule of goodness, justice, or wisdom in doing or not doing any thing. I add, therefore, the minor, and affirm that, the death of Christ being admitted, yet God has heretofore denied, and does now deny to many nations and many individuals, those means without which the death of Christ is applied to no one. This will evidently appear, whether we consider the immediate means of salvation by which man is placed in a state of spiritual life and salvation, and in the actual participation of the death and merits of Christ, such as repentance, faith, regeneration, and sanctification; or whether we regard the external means, which, as instruments, God makes use of to produce the former, such as the sending of teachers and pastors, the preaching of the Gospel, and all other helps, without which those internal and immediate means of salvation cannot ordinarily be produced. With respect to the former, faith and a saving knowledge of Christ, is a special gift, granted to some, denied to others, according to the good pleasure of the Divine will. *It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it*

is not given (Matt. xiii. 11.) *No man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father* (John vi. 65.) *By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God* (Ephes. ii. 8.) *All men have not faith* (2 Thess. iii. 2.) So likewise as to repentance, regeneration, sanctification, all which are given to some because the special mercy of God procures them, but are denied to others, because the same mercy does not unfold its riches to them. *Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned* (Lament. v. 21.) *He hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth* (Rom. ix. 18.) *Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God* (John i. 13) *Blessed be God, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again* (1 Pet. i. 3.) I omit other passages. From these it appears, that God gives or denies to men those means, by which union with Christ and salvation are immediately connected, according to the good pleasure of his will, not according to the difference of the human will. This all the orthodox Fathers have stoutly defended against the Pelagians. Ambrose, on Luke vii. 9, says, *God calls whom he thinks fit, and makes religious whom he will.* Augustine observes, (Epist. 107) *We know that grace is not given to all men, nor according to the merits of their will to whom it is given.* In the same Epistle he teaches further, *That those to whom this grace is not given, differ for the most part by no merit, no will from others, but are in a similar case with those to whom it is given.* As in natural birth the formation by Divine power precedes all will of man to be born; so in spiritual birth, in which we begin to put off the old man, *no man can have a good will of his own motion;* as Fulgentius observes (lib. de Incarn. & Grat. cap. 19,) and again, (cap. 21) *If God by his grace should not give to man, man could never be willing to believe in God, because grace does not find this will, but produces it in man.* It is clear, therefore, that God does not give those internal means promiscuously to all men, by which they may apply to themselves the death of Christ. Nor can our opponents here pretend, that this Divine giving and not giving of faith derives its origin from the

resistance or non-resistance of the human will, since the Scriptures expressly refer this to the good pleasure of God in being willing or not willing to shew compassion; and the Fathers in express words exclude the disparity of the wills of men before grace received.

Hitherto we have disputed about immediate means, let us now descend to the external means, whereby these are conferred. The death and merit of Christ had its efficacy in the acceptation of God from the origin of the world; yet, under the Old Testament, God did not grant to all men every where the external means of its application, but, as the Psalmist says, *He sheweth his word unto Jacob*, &c. *He hath not dealt so with any nation* (Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20.) And of the same sentiment is St. Paul, (Acts xiv. 16) *God in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways.* Prosper has noticed the same thing (De lib. arbitr. p. 225.) He says, *It is not removed from common observation, what countless numbers of mankind in so many ages have died, sunk in their errors and impieties, without any knowledge of the true God.* And looking to the times of the New Testament, he says, (De vocat. Gent. ii. 17) *There are also now, in the extreme parts of the world, some nations upon whom the grace of the Saviour hath not shone.* From which things it follows, that, even the death of Christ being admitted, God is nevertheless not bound, by reason of his goodness or justice, to provide and offer to all men individually the means whereby they may apply Christ to themselves. For with respect to God the argument well follows from fact to right both affirmatively and negatively, *God does this, therefore he does justly; God does not do this, therefore he is not bound by any right that he should do it.*

OBJECTION 1. Some persons meet this argument by—*The reason why the Gospel is not preached every where arises not so much from this, that those who should preach it are not sent by God, as because those who are sent refuse to go.* This is the opinion of Corvinus (contra Tilenum, p. 105.)

REPLY. But if God, by reason of his goodness and justice, as it were from some kind of congruity, the death of Christ being supposed, were bound to communicate to

all sufficient means of application, he would not suffer any one through carelessness to defraud another of a benefit due to him, especially of such an one as that, without which no salvation is to be hoped for. Moreover, it implies a contradiction, that God, by his ordinary law should provide and administer to all men the means relative to the application of Christ, and not administer them to some, because of the carelessness of the preachers. As if the care of the preachers were not to be numbered among these means without which the knowledge and application of Christ preached cannot be obtained. Further, If the goodness and justice of God should require this, that these means of applying Christ should be administered to all, without doubt he would kindle, at least in some of the preachers, a mind and care of preaching and offering the Gospel to some individuals in a nation. For it is he who knows how to send forth labourers into his harvest, according to his good pleasure. And lastly, what carelessness of preachers was the cause that the Gospel was not preached by any one to the Americans two hundred years ago, when nobody ever dreamt that there were such nations in existence? We must, therefore, refer it to a higher cause, namely, the free good pleasure of God in granting or denying these means. He by his special providence directs them to be administered by his servants, as may be seen Acts xvi. 6, 7, *They were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia; after they were come to Mysia, they essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not.*

Objection 2. Secondly, they answer, *That those who have been long destitute of the grace of the Gospel, have refused it by their ancestors, and thus their posterity are deservedly deprived of the preaching of the Gospel, because their ancestors despised it. We are not therefore to refer it to the absolute will of God, that the saving light of the Gospel does not shine upon some nations.* (Corvin. p. 108, and Voss. p. 671).

Reply. But neither do these things well consist with their opinions. For if God, respect being had to the death of Christ, had determined to administer to all men

sufficiently the means of salvation, it would seem not to be equitable, that on account of the preaching of the word, which was despised by their ancestors in the time of Noah, he should deny it to their posterity after some thousands of years. For if notwithstanding the sin of Adam, it was obtained by the death of Christ (according to their opinion) that sufficient means of salvation should be administered to all, it would be unreasonable and unjust to break this, as it were, ordinary law, on pretence of sins committed by some others who were our ancestors. As, therefore, on account of the sin of Adam, God may justly deny to his posterity every spiritual benefit, so we admit that from the sins of the ancestors of others, God may also take occasion to deny to us any gratuitous benefit. But if by the death of Christ and the concurring goodness of God, a law is established concerning the administration of the means of grace, now, as if on account of the sin of Adam, who was the federal head of all his posterity, God will not abrogate this his decree; so much less consistent is it, that on account of the sins of others, who do not sustain this common relationship to the human race, their posterity should be deprived of this benefit. In vain, therefore, do they resort to the sins of their ancestors, in order to give a reason for the denial of this thing, who profess, that by virtue of the death of Christ and the goodness of God, it was prepared for all men individually by the Divine decree, and as it were due to them by an established law.

OBJECTION 3. Thirdly, they answer, *That the grace of the Gospel is denied to some, because by continued transgression against the law they have shewn themselves to be unworthy of having Divine grace offered to them.*

REPLY. But this answer will make the truth of our opinion more evident. For, in the first place, I assume, what no man in his senses will deny, that every man in the state of corrupt nature, if his sins were marked, has shewn himself to be unworthy of the grace of the Gospel. And I also add, That the worthiness and unworthiness of men, or their greater and less unworthiness, is not the rule ac-

cording to which God proceeds in dispensing or denying the Gospel either to individuals or to nations. Which things being granted, it will follow, that unworthiness is always found in those to whom the Gospel is denied; but it is in those also to whom it is granted. Therefore this unworthiness will have the nature of a circumstance which always accompanies the persons to whom the Gospel is given or not given; but it will not be a cause of discrimination why the Gospel is given to one and not given to another. Therefore in this matter we must come to the good pleasure of the Divine will alone, who, as it pleases him, grants his aid both to those who do and to those who do not what they can, as Alvarez says (De Auxil. disp. 58.) But since this answer, which teaches that the grace of the Gospel is repelled by the unworthiness of men, seems tacitly to hint that it may be procured by some degree of worthiness in them, let us hear what the orthodox Fathers have taught against the Pelagians in this matter. Augustine (Epist. 107, p. 500) shews that the saving grace of Christ is not granted nor denied to men according to this rule of greater or less unworthiness. His words have been before quoted. Prosper very often inculcates this (De vocat. Gent. lib. 1, cap. 15), *Part of men are delivered, while another part perish; but if we would ascribe this to the merits of their wills, that it might appear that the wicked had neglected grace and the good had chosen it, the case of people innumerable will oppose us, who throughout so many ages have not been enlightened by the preaching of the heavenly doctrine. Nor can we say, that their posterity were any better, upon whom the light has arisen*, &c. Again (in Carmine de Ingratis, cap. 12,) Prosper shews that this was the very sentiment of the Pelagians, namely, that God of his own goodness was willing to call all men to grace, but that the will of some, *their first light having been extinguished by their vices, had made itself unworthy of a second.* But he contends, that on the contrary, examples may be produced (cap. 14) *which shew that the hearts of the wicked, in whom nothing good had ever dwelt, and who had no sign or sense of righteousness, were converted by the power of God.* The sum of the argument

comes to this, That the grace of the Gospel is not given to men because they are judged worthy of it, since no man is found worthy of so great a gift; nor is it denied to men because they are more unworthy than others, since this light has been granted to the worst, while at the same time it has been denied to those who were less depraved. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the secret good pleasure of God, who, that his mercy may shine more conspicuously, does not regularly grant the light of the Gospel to those who have made a good or a less bad use of the light of nature, but on the contrary, calls to himself the slothful and the negligent, and unworthy and ungrateful sinners. And hence it appears, that God always remains free and that it is in no way inconsistent with his goodness to give or not to give to any men the Gospel, and other means necessary for the application of the merits of Christ, according to the good pleasure of his will, no account being taken of man's worthiness or unworthiness, or his greater or less unworthiness.

ARGUMENT 4. The same may be proved by the manifest inconsistencies by which the contrary opinion is maintained. For if by the death of Christ it has been universally obtained that God should be bound by a fixed decree or by some law of congruity as much as possible, to grant to all men individually the grace of the preaching of the Gospel, and of internal sanctification, then it would follow, that the primary reason why one is actually made partaker of both these gifts, and another is not, consists in this, that the one by opposing an obstacle repels this grace, or altogether prevents it from being offered to him, the other neither repels it nor hinders it. Our adversaries do not avoid this consequence. For they do not restrain the difference of the call of the Gospel and saving grace being denied or granted, to the mere will of God, but to various conditions or dispositions considered on the part of men. Thus Corvinus* says, (contra Tilen. p. 489) *Al-*

* John Arnold CORVINUS was not more distinguished as a lawyer than as a theologian. During the theological disputes which raged in Holland in

though the word of the cross is not preached every where, yet God is ready to announce it to all those who duly submit themselves to the ministry of the law, that is, who follow the light of the law of nature, which flourishes even in the hearts of heathens. And discoursing of natural gifts (p. 118) he says, *That God has left these gifts to the Gentiles, that if, according to the intention of God, they should use those gifts to glorify God, according to the measure of their knowledge, they should be led to Christ and the knowledge of himself; but on the contrary, should be left in their ignorance, if they should hold the truth which they had in unrighteousness.* Here he openly suspends the call of the Gospel on the use or abuse of natural gifts. The same Corvinus contends that internal quickening grace is so set before all men by an ordinary law, that the difference, why one man is actually made a partaker of this grace and another is not, is restrained to the difference of human wills, and not to the good pleasure of God. Yea, he says, *That it is certain that the conversion of no individual in particular is intended by God* (contra Boger. p. 263.) But although these things may be pleasing to human reason, they are contrary to the word of God, and may be overturned by manifest inconveniences. For if we admit, either that the external call of the Gospel, or that internal and effectual infusion of regenerating grace are given and denied according to the various dispositions and operations of men ; it will follow, in the first place, That free-will in a corrupt state, not illuminated with the light of the Gospel, can make such good use of

the former part of the 17th Century, he espoused the side of the Remonstrants or Arminians, among whom he laboured as a minister. Disgusted with the persecutions to which he was exposed, he was obliged in 1622 to retire into the Duchy of Sleswig, whence he proceeded into France. He was admitted Doctor of Law at Orleans, and afterwards practised as an advocate at Amsterdam, where he was appointed professor of Law. Besides various excellent works on the civil law, some of which are deservedly esteemed to this day, he wrote several theological pieces, the most distinguished of which is his *Defensio Sententiæ Jac. Arminii de prædestinatione, gratiâ Dei, libero hominis arbitrio,* &c. *adversum Danielem Tilenum.* Lugduni, 1613, 8vo. He is said to have converted his adversary. Corvinus died in 1650. (Biographie Universelle, tom. X. p. 27.)

its own natural endowments, as that from thence God, according to his ordinary law, dictated to himself of his own goodness, may be bound to give spiritual grace to a natural man. But this is contrary to the Apostle, who says, (Rom. xi. 6) *grace is no more grace, if it be of works.* For, as Fulgentius says, (De Incarn. & Grat. Christi, cap. 18) *We should not then receive it from the compassion of the Giver, but from the equity of retribution.* Secondly, It would follow also, that the reason of predestination and preterition is to be assigned to the different qualities or actions of men, which all the orthodox oppose; since the reason of predestination, which is a preparation of grace, cannot be different from the reason of grace, which is the bringing of it into act. He, therefore, who teaches that the reason of grace being given or not given, is to be sought from human dispositions or operations, necessarily seeks for the same reason of predestination and preterition. Thirdly, It would follow, that God would oppose a law made by himself, when he, as it were, forces grace upon those who place an obstacle to his grace, which the Apostle Paul most humbly confesses that he had done; and yet God mercifully called him to the knowledge and grace of Christ, when he was committing a flagrant sin and rushing against Christ. On which Fulgentius excellently observes (De Incarn. & Grat. cap. 18,) *In what the mercy of God prevents us, or preventing what things it finds in us, the Teacher of the Gentiles shews us, not in any other, but in himself, saying,* WHO WAS BEFORE *a blasphemer,* &c. Here he intimates, indeed, that all men are refractory until preventing grace subdues them. Fourthly, If it be admitted, that this giving or denying of grace, is according as human wills place an obstacle in the way or not, almost all the definitions in the Councils against the Pelagians will be set aside, such as, first, the decree against Pelagius in the Diospolitan Council,* *It is confessed, that grace is not given*

* This Council was convened in the year 418, by two Bishops of Gaul, Heros and Lazarus, who joined with Orosius, a Spanish Priest of that period, and drew up a Petition embodying the errors wherewith they charged Pelagius, as contained in his books, and taught by Cœlestinus his disciple.

of merit, in order that it may be true grace, that is, given freely through his mercy, who hath said, I WILL HAVE MERCY ON WHOM I WILL HAVE MERCY. For that grace should be given or not given, according to the use made of natural endowments, as it may be rightly or not, or (as others say) according as a man does or does not what he can, is the same with the Fathers, *as to be given of merit, and denied of demerit.* Further, neither will the decree of the African fathers in their Synodical epistle* stand good. *Grace itself is in no way acknowledged, unless it be given, and as long as it is not in man, so long he necessarily opposes it in word or in work.* How can it be understood, that the grace of the Gospel is to be given to heathens who are in the state of corrupt nature, as it were, on this condition, if they oppose no obstacle to grace, since so long as they are destitute of grace, they necessarily resist it, by the necessity indeed of a depraved disposition and habit. Lastly, they oppose the decrees of the Council of Orange (Canon 4) *If any one contends that God waits for our will, in order to cleanse us from sin; and does not confess, that even if we are willing to be cleansed, this desire is wrought in us by the operation and influence of the Holy Spirit, he opposes the Apostle.* And Canon 6, *If any one subjoins the help of grace to the humility and obedience of man,* &c. *he opposes the Apostle.* I omit others. Let them explain to us, how God cannot be said to wait for the will of man, and to subjoin the help of supernatural grace to the obedience of the law of nature written in the hearts of men, if, the death of Christ being granted, according to his common mode of acting, God gives grace to all, if they make a right use of their natural endowments, and does not give it, if they do not make a

This accusation was preferred to a synod of fourteen Bishops, held at Diospolis, antiently called Lydda, a city of Palestine. Eulogius of Cæsaria was President, and John of Jerusalem held the second place. Pelagius appeared and disowned the errors attributed to him. Augustine has recorded the acts of this Council in the Book of Pelagius's acts, and has also given an abridgment of them in his 106th Letter.—Vide *Du Pin* and *Milner*.

* This refers to a Council held about the same period and on the same occasion as above described.

right use of them. Since, therefore, all these things are far from the truth, it remains that we should say that God, notwithstanding the merit of the death of Christ, may and does give or deny the grace of applying this merit to individuals, according to the good pleasure and freedom of his own will, and not according to the merits or various operations of the wills of mankind.

ARGUMENT 5. Our opinion is confirmed by the useful ends which it serves to illustrate, and which are altogether abrogated by the contrary opinion. For example, If God, the death of Christ being admitted, be assumed nevertheless to distribute the grace by which it may be applied, or not to distribute to men, according to his own good pleasure, and not according to any disparity of human wills or actions, from thence will appear,—First, the absolute liberty of God in the first conferring of grace; which Divine attribute in this thing is to be acknowledged by all. *I will give unto this man, even as unto thee,* (Matt. xx. 14) is the voice of God asserting for himself his own liberty, even when the merits of men are unequal. But also, *I will give to this man and not to thee* is a word equally worthy of God, where all things on the part of men are acknowledged to be equal, and it equally goes to illustrate the supreme liberty of God, as St. Paul proves, Rom. ix. For although God were willing to be bound by the virtue and efficacy of the death of Christ, to give remission of sins to those who believe, and to give glory to those who are regenerate and ingrafted into Christ, yet he hath not willed that he should be obliged to give the Gospel to such and such nations or individuals, or to give faith and efficacious grace in consequence of considering any of their actions or dispositions in the state of corrupt nature, without Christ. They, therefore, go to diminish the Divine liberty which God hath reserved to himself, who teach that grace is communicated or denied to men according to their good or bad use of nature; which is the same as if they should say, That grace is prevented by nature.

Secondly, According to our opinion, that which the Scriptures urge so much, becomes conspicuous, viz. the

gratuitous and special mercy of God in giving to some men both the light of the Gospel and saving grace. On which Prosper appositely remarks (De vocat. Gent. lib. 2, cap. 31,) *There is some part of the human race, which is led by special benefits to eternal salvation.* They altogether take away this special mercy, who think that by the death of Christ it was effected that God should offer the means of saving grace to all, but should leave to the special free-will of individuals whether they would obey or resist offered grace; so that if they oppose no obstacle, grace should be given them, but if they do, they should be deprived of grace. For according to the opinion of these persons, God did not shew any special mercy to Jacob or Peter, which he did not shew to Esau or Judas; but Jacob and Peter applied to themselves, by some special operation, what Esau and Judas neglected to apply. This Faustus of Rheis taught openly, (De lib. arbitr. lib. 1, cap. 10) who denied the special dispensation of God concerning the salvation of certain men; which he learnt from Pelagius, as may be seen from Prosper, (Carm. de Ingratis. cap. 10.) But Augustine thought otherwise (De bono persever. cap. 12,) *The Lord gives to whom he will because he is merciful; and does not give to whom he will not, that he may make known the riches of his glory in the vessels of mercy.*

Thirdly, According to our opinion it follows, that all occasion of glorying is taken away from men, and the glory of human salvation is wholly attributed to God, who distinguishes one man from another, according to the saying of the Apostle, (1 Cor. iv. 7) *Who maketh thee to differ? What hast thou that thou didst not receive? From whom,* says Augustine, *but from him who maketh thee to differ from another, to whom he hath not given what he hath given to thee?* (De præd. Sanct. cap. 9.) But if the opinion of those should be adopted, who think that by the death of Christ God is made equally benevolent towards all men, and contend that from this equal inclination towards all men, he so administers his grace, that whosoever makes a good use of the light of nature, or does what he can of himself, attracts this grace to himself, and he who makes a bad use

of the same light, or does not do what he can of himself, does not obtain it; he who thus becomes a partaker of grace, has just ground of glorying in himself, because, by his own free-will, he made himself to differ from another, from whom he was not made to differ by any special gift of Divine mercy.

ARGUMENT 6. If, the death of Christ being supposed, according to the decree of God, the gift or denial of grace to individuals proceeds not from the absolute freedom of God, but from the difference of human wills and actions, then it is easy for any one to give an account why the Gospel was denied to one nation, why it was granted to another, and why faith, and quickening and regenerating grace is given to some individuals and not to others. For on the part of those that have it, it is answered, That the light of the Gospel was given to them, because they made a good or not a bad use of the light of nature. On the part of those that have it not, it is answered, that they remain destitute of the light of the Gospel, because they have not made a good use of the light of nature. And so among Christians, if it should be inquired, why one man has faith and regenerating grace, and another has it not? on the part of those who have it, it is answered, Because they were willing to believe, and were unwilling to put any obstacle in the way; and on the part of those who have it not, Because they would not believe, and would not remove the obstacle to grace. At the same time, there is not one word about the special call, according to his own purpose, wherewith God powerfully inclines the hearts of those to believe whom specially he is willing to pity. I now add, that it is the Pelagians who give so obvious a reason why grace is obtained or not on the part of men, and that it is condemned by all the orthodox; who always limit the gift or denial of efficacious grace to the secret purpose of the good pleasure of God; nor do they think that, the death of Christ being admitted, God is so bound to administer his own grace promiscuously, that to have it or not to have it, depends on the difference of human wills. We do not deny the demerit, unworthiness, and voluntary

wickedness of those who remain without grace; but we assert, that all labour under this disease until they are healed by the remedy of special grace. Nor do any of the unregenerate by a better will than others, attract grace to themselves, but they receive a better will through efficacious grace given to them of the mere good pleasure of God, according to the saying of the Apostle (Rom. ix. 16,) *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy;* and Phil. ii. 13, *It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.* To this Prosper refers the difference between believers and unbelievers, (Ad excerpta Genuens. resp. ad Dub. 4) *Many hear the word of truth, but some believe it, others speak against it, these therefore are willing to believe it, the others are unwilling. Who does not know this? Who will deny this? But since for some the will is not prepared by the Lord, it is to be discussed what may come of mercy, and what of judgment.* And a little after, *Mercy and judgment are made in the wills themselves.* To this secret good pleasure of God, and not to the difference of human wills applying or not applying themselves to offered grace, according to their own innate liberty, Augustine also every where refers the actual participation of grace, (De bono persever. cap. 8) *Of two wicked men of adult age, why one is so called that he follows him that calls him, the other is either not called, or is not so called that he follows him that calls him, are the inscrutable judgments of God.* And (De præd. Sanct. cap. 8) he says, *Why does not God teach all men? If we should say, because those whom he does not teach are unwilling to learn, an answer will be given to us, where it is said,* LORD, THOU WILT TURN AND QUICKEN US.

Lastly, Aquinas himself does not think that any other reason is to be given why the gifts of saving grace are given to some individuals and not to others, beside the simple will of God. (Contr. Gent. lib. 3, cap. 161.) He says, *Although he who sins puts an impediment in the way of grace, and as far as the order of things requires ought not to receive grace, yet sometimes of the abundance of his goodness, God prevents with his help those who offer an impediment to*

grace, turning them from evil, and converting them to good, &c. Afterwards he adds, *He does not prevent with his help all who impede grace, but some, in whom he chooses to shew his mercy, as in others the order of justice is manifested.* At length, lest we should refer it to the difference of human wills, that some obtain efficacious grace and are converted, and others do not obtain it and remain unconverted, he subjoins these words most worthy of observation, *Since God, from among the men who are held under the same sins, by his preventing grace converts some, but endures others, or permits them to go on according to the order of things, the reason is not to be sought why he converts some and not others; for this depends on his simple will, in the same manner as it proceeded from his simple will, that when he made all things of nothing, some things were made more honourable than others.* Such is the opinion of Thomas Aquinas. Therefore there is not any Divine decree established by the death of Christ concerning grace being administered promiscuously to all men, as it were, with this condition annexed, that individuals should become partakers or not of this grace, as they should put obstacles in the way or not; but the difference between those that place an obstacle in the way, and those who do not, is to be resolved into the mere good pleasure of God, as the primary and radical cause.

ARGUMENT 7. If the will of God, through the death of Christ, be understood as determined to administer grace to all men individually, by which they may apply Christ to themselves and be saved; yet so, that those only receive and possess grace who have either made a good use of the light of nature, or have not opposed an obstacle to the grace which is offered to them, and all others do not receive grace, then the ultimate reason of obtaining or not obtaining grace and salvation, would not be attributed to the good pleasure of God, but to human free-will. The consequence is clear and strong; because by those who are of this opinion, God is presumed, on account of the death of Christ, to administer and offer to all men grace sufficient to apply Christ to themselves and to obtain salvation; he is also presumed not to give saving grace to any

one of his absolute or mere good pleasure. Thus the Remonstrants, in the declaration of their opinion about the third article of the Acts of the Synod of Dort, (p. 15) say, *That the saving efficacy of grace depends not on the congruity of the calling of God (as some Papists assert), nor on the omnipotent power of God, as Prosper* (Carm. de Ingr. cap. 14 and 15) *and Augustine affirm,* (Contr Julian. lib. 5, cap. 3; De præd. Sanct. cap. 2; De grat. & libr. arbit. cap. 20, and De corrept. & grat. cap. 14) *but on such an operation as produces its effect most certainly, when man does not oppose that rebellion, which he can oppose from himself.* As if they should say, that grace is effectual in certain individuals, because they do not oppose any obstacle to it, when they ought to say, that the reason why an obstacle is not opposed is, because God of his own good pleasure has given effectual grace. I now add a minor, and affirm that it is altogether averse from theology and from truth, to contend that any decree is established by the death of Christ, according to which the certain procuring of grace and salvation is referred, not to the absolute will of God, but to the determination of the human will. For the method of obtaining or not obtaining salvation, which is resolved into the freedom of the human will, was *the first grace, which was given to the first Adam,* as Augustine has rightly observed, (De corrept. & grat. cap. 11 and 12) *but that is far more powerful which is given in Christ to all who are saved; from which it arises that they should be willing and only willing, in order really to overcome the reluctant will of the flesh.* Therefore, after Christ is given to us, this distinction, that some have that grace by which they apply Christ to themselves for salvation, and others have it not, is to be referred, not to the difference of human wills, but to the good pleasure of the will of God.

Argument 8. Our last argument is derived from the testimonies of the Fathers, who willingly confess, that to some persons, and that according to the good pleasure of the Divine will, those means and gifts are not granted, by which they may be able to believe in Christ and obtain salvation; which God would never omit to do, if, the death

of Christ being admitted, the goodness, wisdom, and justice of God required that it should be supplied to all men individually. Nor shall we quote only certain individual Fathers, but produce a few testimonies from those who were engaged with the Pelagians and Semipelagians. But I premise one thing worthy of observation, When we say that the orthodox Fathers who opposed Pelagius and the Pelagians, admit that grace is given to all men, out of regard to the death of Christ, the word *grace* is not to be extended beyond its proper limits (as the Pelagians formerly extended it). For whatever is graciously granted by God to men, may in some sense be called *grace*. Thus the light of nature with which God illuminates every man that comes into the world; that testimony of things created, by which the heathen are directed to some knowledge of the Creator; those external benefits by which God testifies his philanthropy towards the whole world; those internal motions with which he sometimes affects the minds of heathens, so as to restrain them from any evil work, or to excite them to any good work, may in this large sense claim the name of *grace*. The Pelagians concealed the poison of their pestilential doctrine under this general notion of *grace*. But neither do the Scriptures so understand the grace given by Christ, nor the holy Fathers, who, after the rise of Pelagius, learnt to speak more cautiously. Under the name of *the grace of Christ*, or *saving grace*, received in the sense of the Scriptures, those benefits and supernatural gifts alone are meant, which are directly ordained for obtaining salvation through Christ, but not infallibly: such as the preaching of the Gospel; the illumination of the minds of men in the mysteries of the faith, and, in one word, whatever supernaturally tends to unite men to Christ and place them in a state of salvation, yet does not of itself unite them to him, or translate them from a state of death to a state of salvation. This preaching and knowledge of the Gospel the Apostle has designated by the name of *grace*, (1 Cor. i. 4, and ii. 11), and hence it is that St. Peter (1 Epist. iv. 10) calls preachers *stewards of the manifold grace of God*. So Augustine calls the Gospel

itself, (De pecc. mer. & rem. lib. i. 22) *the Christian grace;* and Prosper calls it *the grace of salvation,* (De voc. Gent. lib. ii. cap. 17) and in this sense he affirms that some nations *were living without the grace of God,* (Sentent. 10, super Capit. Gallor.) namely, when they were living where no one preached to them the Gospel of Christ. There are also other supernatural gifts which place those who have them in a state of salvation, such as a good Will, Faith, Conversion, Regeneration, and, in short, those which belong only to men who are ingrafted into Christ and reconciled to God. And these Augustine thinks are to be properly called by the name of *the grace of Christ.* But the former, viz. the preaching and knowledge of Christian doctrine, he applies to this grace of Christ properly so called, so far as they serve to produce and promote it. In his book on the grace of Christ (Epist. 95, cap. 10, 47) he professedly treats of it, so as to shew, that by this name he means not the illumination of the mind and excitement of the will, but faith itself and the gift of a good will. This grace of Christ he paints in lively colours, and calls it *the grace whereby we are justified from iniquity and are saved from infirmity; the grace which we have not in common with the wicked, but that whereby we become the sons of God.* Let us now attend to the testimonies of the Fathers.

First, we shall produce those which affirm that the grace of the preaching of the Gospel, the death of Christ being supposed, is due or given to all men, yea, affirm that it is denied to some, and that according to the purpose of the Divine will, which would never be done, if grace were due to all by the merit of the death of Christ. Augustine (de bono persev. cap. 8) observes, *Of two wicked men of adult age, why one is so called, that he should obey the call, and another is either not called at all, or not effectually, is to be referred to the inscrutable judgments of God.* Here he plainly acknowledges that some are not called at all. And (cap. 14) he teaches, *that to some who by the supreme judgment of God are not separated from the mass of perdition, those means are not granted by which they might believe.* In both of these passages he asserts the denial of means, and refers to the

inscrutable abyss of Divine predestination, and not to the differences of human wills or actions, as the Pelagians and Semipelagians did. See also cap. 11, where he refers it to the will of God, and secret predestination, that God does not grant assistance to some. Prosper plainly asserts that the means of saving grace, or the call to grace, are denied to some, (Resp. 4 ad Cap. Gall.) where he does not repel this objection as false, *That all men are not called to grace,* but acknowledges that this may be truly said of all those, *to whom he hath not made known the mystery of the cross of Christ, and the redemption of his blood.* And (Sentent. 4) as afore-mentioned, *We cannot say that there is a call of grace where there are as yet no sacraments of the Church.* In which passage is to be observed, that he opposes those who defend the opinion of grace procured for and offered to all for Christ's sake, and who imagine, I know not what calling and sufficiency of grace, in the midst of the darkness of Paganism. What Prosper has spoken of little children, we may say of adults, (Resp. ad obj. 4) *Let them be proved to be called in any way, to whom the planter could not preach, nor the waterer assist.* Fulgentius, (lib. 1, de verit. Prædest.) *To men who are capable of reason, God either grants or denies means suitable to salvation, shewing his justice towards some, his mercy to others.* His meaning is, That God sends or does not send preachers of the Gospel, according to his good pleasure; he sends when he is willing to shew his mercy; he does not send when he chooses to manifest his justice. I add also from Fulgentius, that the common guilt which all men have contracted in Adam, suffices to justify the denial of the grace of the Gospel to any man. His words are, *This grace of God by which we are saved is not given for any preceding good desert, nor yet is it denied for any preceding evil desert. For the first man transmitted the deserts of his sin to all his posterity,* &c. From which it appears, that according to the opinion of Fulgentius, original sin is a sufficiently just cause why the grace of Christ should be denied to any man. Which Aquinas himself acknowledges, (2ª. 2æ. qu. 2ª. art. 5º. resp. ad 1m.) where he says, *the help of grace is mercifully given to some, to others*

of justice it is not given, in punishment of preceding sin, at least of original sin. From all these things, we have what we proposed to confirm in the first place, viz. That there is no law decreed or appointed, by the merit of the death of Christ, for administering the means of the grace of the Gospel to the whole human race: but that God, notwithstanding any respect to the death of Christ, may of right deny, and actually has denied to some, even the call of grace.

Secondly, from the same Fathers we shall shew, that that grace, which we call by way of eminence *the grace of Christ*, that is, which makes a man to be a living member of Christ, and a partaker of salvation and eternal life, is not prepared and offered, much less given to all by the merit of the death of Christ, but is prepared and offered and given to some, and is not prepared for or given to others, and that according to the absolute good pleasure of God. Augustine (Contr. duas epist. Pelag. lib. 2, cap. 2) says, *According to the purpose of God one is called, another is not called. To him who is called he gives gratuitously that which is good; of which good, calling is the chief: to him who is not called, he renders evil, because all are guilty, since by one man sin entered into the world.* From which words it appears that calling according to purpose, which communicates faith and love, and places man in a state of salvation, is given to some, and is denied to others. Moreover it is also evident, that this grace is given to them to whom it is given, not on account of any special obedience of the will of the person who receives it, but of the special mercy of God, who calls and inclines the will to obedience. It appears further, that the common guilt which all have contracted in Adam, is enough to defend the justice of God in respect of those whom he passes by as to the gift of saving grace, which even Bellarmin does not dare to deny, as may be seen (lib. 20, de Grat. & lib. arb. cap. 4.) A second testimony of Augustine is contained (lib. 4, Contra duas epist. Pelag. 6,) *He who makes men his sheep, makes free the wills of men to the obedience of piety. But why he makes some men his sheep, and does not make others, is*

a question which pertains to that depth, which the Apostle desiring to look into, stopped and exclaimed, OH, THE DEPTH *of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.* (Rom. xi. 33,) In these words, by *making some and not others his sheep,* he means nothing more than *making some faithful and obedient, and not making others so.* Both are attributed to God, and that according to the purpose of his secret will. Therefore there has not been established by the death of Christ such a decree, as some have formed, for preparing, offering, and giving to all men that grace by which they may be rendered believing and obedient, under the condition of free-will embracing it. A third testimony is taken from (De Præd. Sanctor. cap. 9,) *Faith, both in its commencement and perfection, is the gift of God. And that this gift is granted to some and not to others, cannot be doubted at all by any who do not wilfully oppose the most plain words of Scriptures. But why it is not given to all, ought not to stagger the believer, who believes that from one all are under condemnation.* He clearly teaches that the grace of faith is not given to all; and that there is no need of seeking any reason why this grace is not given, since that damnable state in which we were all born is sufficient to shew the justice of God, even if he should not give the grace of salvation to any mortal man. A fourth testimony is derived from the book (De corrept. & Grat. cap. 5.) where the unbelieving and rebellious are reproved in this manner, *I should be rightly blamed, if I had it not* (that is, faith and obedience) *of my own fault, that is, if I could give it to myself, or take it, and should not do so, or if God should give it and I should be unwilling to receive it. But when the very will is prepared by the Lord, why do you blame me,* &c. Augustine answers in this manner, (cap. 6) *The original depravity through which God is disobeyed, is of man, because by falling, through his own evil will, from that uprightness in which God at first made him, he became depraved. Therefore the damnable origin should be blamed, that from the grief of correction the will of regeneration may arise, if he who is corrected is a child of promise, that God may by his secret inspi-*

ration work within him both to will and to do. To this I add a passage very similar, from Epist. 105. Pelagius objects, *What are we to do, who live wickedly, since we have not received grace from whence we should live well?* Augustine replies merely, *They cannot truly say they have done no evil, who of their own accord live wickedly.* And a little after, *They may impute this to themselves, who are of that mass, which God hath deservedly and justly condemned on account of the sin of one.* It is to be observed, that in both these passages Augustine allows that there are some to whom God hath denied his grace; and also, that those to whom it is not given, cannot take it to themselves; and further, that original guilt and depravity is a sufficient reason why God should deny the grace of Christ to any one, according to his own will. Moreover, it is also to be observed, that Augustine does not imagine that the saving grace of Christ is any thing offered to the human will, which knocks in order that it may gain admittance, but something communicated, which heals and quickens the will to which it is given. The last testimony which we shall produce from Augustine is contained in Epist. 107, where he enumerates against the Pelagians twelve opinions relating to the catholic faith, the fourth of which is, *We know that the grace of God is not given to all men.* But lest any one should pretend, that by the death of Christ it was effected, that grace is prepared for and offered to all, although it may be possessed or not, according as men are willing or not to accept it; this opinion also is excluded in the fifth and sixth: of which we shall speak more hereafter. From Augustine let us proceed to Prosper. He says (ad excerpta Genuens. resp. ad dub. 4,) *When the word of truth is preached, some willingly believe it, others do not believe it; but it is because God opens the hearts of some, and does not open the hearts of others.* Which is the same as if he had said, that the grace of faith is given to some, and denied to others. And (resp. ad dub. 8,) *What else can we say of the Tyrians and Sidonians, than that it was not given to them to believe? But why it was denied to them, let them say if they can,* &c. Prosper asserts two things: first, that the gift

of faith is denied to some men: secondly, that the cause why it is denied, is inscrutable. Lastly, in his book de Ingratis, (cap. 6) he states it to be an error of the Pelagians,

> Quod sine delectu seu lex seu gratia Christi
> Omnem hominem salvare velit; donúmque vocantis
> Sic sit propositum ut nullus non possit ad illud
> Libertate suâ proprióque vigore venire.

That without any choice, or law, or grace of Christ, he wills the salvation of every man; and the gift of calling is so proposed that there is no one but might come to it by his own freedom and strength.

Then he paints the opinion of the Semipelagians in these colours, cap. 10;

> Gratia quâ Christi populus sumus hoc cohibetur
> Limite vobiscum, et formam hanc adscribitis illi;
> Ut cunctos vocet illa quidem invitetque, nec ullum
> Præteriens, studeat communem adferre salutem
> Omnibus, &c.

The grace by which we become the people of Christ is restrained by you in this limit, and you ascribe this form to it; that it calls and invites all, and not passing by any, endeavours to bring a common salvation to all, &c.

> .... Dic, unde probes quòd gratia Christi,
> Nullum omnino hominem de cunctis qui generantur.
> Prætereat?

Tell me, from whence you can prove that the grace of Christ does not pass by any man at all of all who are born? Therefore, any one who contends that grace is given to all, is esteemed by Prosper to have the fibres of Pelagian virulence. Let us now hear Fulgentius. In his book (de verit. Prædest. Biblioth. Patr. tom. 6, p. 158,) he has these words, *The holy Fathers who held the truth of Apostolical preaching most certainly knew, and left it in their books to be known, that the grace of Christ is not given to all men generally.* A little after, *We should not therefore think that the grace of God is given to all men. For all men have not faith, and some do not receive the love of God that they may be saved. In whom, nevertheless, it is the fault of the human will, that they do not believe or love God, which, as long as grace, the*

gift of God, does not change, either does not understand the commands of God, or despises them when understood, &c. Again, *No man can desire, or ask for, or even know this grace, unless he should first receive it from God.* What is more plain, if Fulgentius be believed, than that quickening grace is not given by God to all men, and that it cannot be possessed by any one to whom it is not given from above? If plainer words are wanted, I add (from the book de Incarnat. & Grat. Jesu Christi, p. 89,) *God who prepares the will, himself also gives it. If God should not give it to man by his grace, man can never be willing to believe in God, because grace does not find this will, but works it in man.* You see that the opinion of those Fathers who opposed the Pelagians and Semipelagians, is in agreement; That quickening and saving grace is not given to all men, and that a vitiated will can indeed, from its own depravity, loathe the grace which is not given to it, and repel it when it is offered in the external means, but it cannot lay hold of and take to itself this quickening grace by the strength of its own innate liberty.

But since the very marrow of Pelagianism consists in the way in which they pretend that quickening grace is administered to men by God, and is accepted by men, let us shew what the adherents to the Pelagian faction, and what the orthodox Fathers, state on this subject, by bringing forward the testimonies on both sides.

With respect to the Pelagians. They maintain that quickening and regenerating grace so flows to all men from the death and merit of Christ, through the mercy of God, that *to be quickened and regenerated,* or *not to be quickened and regenerated,* depends primarily on the will of man embracing or despising grace. To this then their opinion amounts, That saving grace is offered to all men, in Christ, of the pure mercy of God, but is given to no one of his absolute good pleasure. But if it should be particularly inquired, Why is the saving grace of Christ given to one, and not given to others? they answer, Because one is willing to receive it when it is offered, the other is unwilling. But let them speak for themselves. Vitalis of Car-

thage* (apud Augustinum, Epist. 107) contends, *that grace follows the will of man, and is given to men because they are willing* to receive it. The remnants of the Pelagian heresy, the Massilians,† say, (apud Prosperum in Epist. ad Augustin.) *As far as it pertains to God, eternal life is prepared for all; but as far as it relates to the freedom of the will, it is apprehended by those who of their own accord believe in God, and receive the help of grace through the merit of their believing.* Pelagius himself says, (apud Augustin. de Grat. Christi. contra P. & C. lib. 1, cap. 31, p. 781) *That men who make a good use of their free-will deserve the grace of God, but others having a free-will, by which they may come to faith, and merit the grace of God, through making a bad use of their freedom, are destitute of grace and incur damnation.* Faustus of Rheis says, *It is of the goodness of God, that man is called, it is of his own will that he readily obeys.*

But let us turn from the antient Pelagians and Semipelagians, to those who abominate the name of Pelagians, but are not averse from their error. In this class I place those Papists who teach that grace is efficacious through the consent of the human will; so that if it should happen that the will assented, then God would grant quickening grace, but if it should resist, then the operation of God, who is willing to quicken and regenerate the soul, is rendered vain. Among these also I think Arminius and his disciples are to be numbered, who suspend the giving or denying of saving grace upon the will of man, so that they say, That God does not will the conversion and regeneration of any one of his absolute good pleasure, but that he wills the conversion and regeneration of all on this condition, viz. if they should not resist his exciting grace,

* VITALIS was a Spaniard contemporary with Augustine, and considered as the founder of the Semipelagians. Before he fell into the errors here attributed to him, he had been bewildered on other grounds, and wrote his Diocesan, Capreolus Bishop of Carthage, to know if he might say, that God is born of a Virgin.—Vide Du Pin, Vol. II. Cent. 5, p. 49.

† These were Presbyters of Marseilles originally called Massalia. Pelagianism having lost its first ground, these men took refuge in the more specious notions of Vitalis.—Vide Milner, Vol. II. p. 388.

but he leaves them unconverted, if they do resist it. Thus the Remonstrants speak, (Acta Synod. p. 21, Explic. 3, & 4 art.) *If the reason be inquired why one is converted and not another, it is answered, One is converted because God converts him, since he does not oppose new contumacy; the other is not converted, because he opposes a new contumacy.* In which they state the reason of the gift and denial of Divine and saving grace to arise from the different acts of the human will, but a deep silence is always observed by them on the subject of God removing, of his special mercy, the stony and rebellious heart, or his not removing it, according to the liberty of his own will. Thus also Corvinus does not ascribe it to the difference of Divine, but of human will, that we have or have not that grace by which we are converted and saved. (Contra Bogerman, p. 263.) *It is certain, the conversion of no one in particular is intended by God.* A little after, *Granting all the operations which God makes use of to effect conversion in us, still conversion remains so much in our power that we cannot be converted.* Such is their opinion.

But very different is that of the holy and orthodox Fathers. They taught that the grace which quickens, regenerates, and converts the soul, was not given or denied according to the assent or dissent of free-will, but according to the gratuitous and absolute will of God, as he is willing or unwilling to take away the innate hardness of the human heart. Let us produce Augustine in the first place, who, always admitting the accomplishment of the work of human redemption on the cross, contends that some have grace because God of his special mercy hath wrought in them that they should receive it; and that others have it not, because God did not choose to soften their rebellious hardness by having compassion upon them. What he has stated is very plain, (Retract. lib. 1, cap. 10) *What I have said, that all men are able to turn themselves to fulfil the commands of God, if they are willing, let not the Pelagians think that is spoken according to their opinion. For it is altogether true that all men can do this if they will; but the will is prepared by the Lord, and is so much*

increased by the gift of love, that they are able to do it. From which words it appears, that the conversion of the human will to God does not depend on this condition, if it is willing to obey of its own excitement; but that the will and the power depend on the preparation of God, and the gift of love. Again, Augustine says, (Epist. 107) *How is it said, that all men would receive grace, if those to whom it is not given did not refuse it of their own will, when it is not given to many infants who have not a contrary will?* And shortly after, *How are the merits of the human will weighed in this matter, since those to whom that grace is not given are in a similar condition with those to whom it is given, and yet by the just judgment of God it is not given to them?* But let us hear the sentiments of others. Prosper says, *Who disputes that free-will becomes obedient to the exhortation of him that calls, when the grace of God hath begotten in it the desire of believing and obeying? The grace of God is not therefore given to the will on condition of obedience, but having been given, it produces obedience.* Again (De vocat. Gent. lib. 1, cap 18,) *The will of God is the cause of receiving grace in all men of every condition and age; with him the reason of election is concealed; from that grace desert arises, but it is received without merit.* This testimony is to be observed, because although this author, whoever he was, contends that the help is not totally taken away from any men, yet he does not think that it is so offered to all, that the difference why one receives it and another does not, is referred to this, that one is willing to receive it, the other to resist it; but he refers the cause of the reception of grace to the secret election of God, and consequently also the cause of its not being received, as far as it is a mere denial, to the secret non-election of God. But if it should be considered as a moral omission on the part of men who resist grace, then it is to be referred to the corruption of mankind. But to proceed. Fulgentius every where refutes this error of the Pelagians, who think that saving grace is procured for and offered to all men in Christ the Redeemer, as it were on this condition, that some should have it, because they were willing to receive it, others should be destitute

of it, because they chose to repel it. But he teaches that a good will was given to some, and that it could not but be repelled by all to whom it is not given. We produced some of his testimonies before, we will now subjoin some others. (Lib. 1, de ver. Prædest. p. 158,) *Not indeed because we will, do we receive grace, but neither is grace given to us whilst we are willing.* A little after, p. 159, *Grace alone produces a good will in us, it alone gives faith to the will. The will, which has not faith, cannot have any merit of faith to be received, because not to have faith is to displease God.* Again, (lib. 2, not far from the beginning, p. 160) *It is the part of God to give his grace to what men he will, and as much as he will. He does not give it as due to the wills or works of men, but being merciful and kind, he gratuitously pours it into the hearts of those whom he has enlightened. And therefore he freely grants it to whom he will, and as much as he will, because he is not invited by any beginning of good will, nor by the effect of any good work, before he bestows grace.* These things are a death-blow to Pelagian and also to Arminian sentiments, which state that quickening and saving grace (of which Fulgentius speaks) are prepared or given to no one according to the purpose of the election of God, but are contingently given or denied to some according to the different condition of the human will obeying or opposing it: which theology displeased even the sounder Papists. A few testimonies of whom we shall add by way of overweight.

Dominicus Bannes (in 1, Aquin. qu. 32, conclus. ult. p. 278) says, *God determined from eternity, by a will either absolute or consequent, not to give to all men supernatural assistance. But if any one should inquire why he rather confers these gifts on some persons in particular, but denies them to others, this depends on the simple will of God, neither is any reason of it to be sought, as Augustine and Thomas teach us.* A little after, *Therefore let the Christian and humble divine learn with Thomas and Augustine to be ignorant, rather than with the curious to be wise more than he ought, lest he should fall into the Pelagian heresy, by referring a difference of this kind to free-will, as its first and radical cause, namely, Because*

one was willing to be converted, the other was not willing. He adds further what strikes at the sinews of the Pelagian and Arminian theology, *The concurrence of free-will is an effect necessarily consequent, by the necessity of consequence, from Divine efficacious aid.* In these words the learned Bannes rejects and condemns the opinion of those who contend that regenerating and saving grace are procured for and set before all men on account of the merit of Christ. And he also refutes those who resolve the reason why some are regenerated or converted, and others are not, into the willing and refusing of mankind. And he further teaches, that our concurrence or non-resistance, that is, our being willing is the necessary effect of effectual grace given, and therefore is not the reason of its being given or received.

Alvarez (De auxiliis Divinæ grat. disp. 58, p 262) says, *If we should assert that there was a law made by God, for infallibly giving effectual aid to those that well used, or were willing to use sufficient aid of their own innate liberty alone, then the beginning of effectual grace would be from nature, and from the innate liberty of the man, who is willing to make a good use of sufficient aid.* This is the very law or decree of God which is contended for with such earnestness by Arminius, Corvinus, and other Divines of the same school. For they say, that sufficient grace is given to all, on account of the merit of Christ, the Mediator; but that effectual grace, or that which actually converts and regenerates, is given on this condition, if they make a good use of it when it excites them, or is sufficient for them; that is, if the will, being excited by grace and made able, puts forth its innate power of willing; which is ascribing the beginning of effectual grace to nature. Alvarez says again, (ibid.) *This conclusion is false; Because man being excited by God is willing to consent, therefore he is assisted. But this is true: Because man being excited by sufficient grace is assisted with effectual aid, therefore he co-operates.* Which he fully proves (Disp. 99,) where he also asserts that this proposition is most true, *Because God wills that man should will, therefore man wills.* These things are diametrically

opposed to the opinions of the Arminians, who deny that any antecedent will of God is the cause why some believe rather than others, and are converted and effectually saved; and refer all this difference to the antecedent will of men, who, when they are excited by grace common to others, are willing beyond others to believe, to convert themselves, to lay hold of salvation.

William Estius,* formerly Professor in the Academy of Douay, (in 1 Sentent. disp. 46, sec. 2, p. 222) says, *We ought not to imagine in God any will, desire, or endeavour, by which he wills, endeavours, strives, and as far as he can effects, that all men should be saved, which nevertheless does not therefore follow, because the bad will of man resists his good will, and through its prevailing and hindering, the will of God is frustrated.* But this is almost all which some contend was procured by the death of Christ, namely, that God, by offering saving grace to all men promiscuously, is willing to save those who of their own accord apply themselves to obtain his grace, and condemns those who resist it.

In the last place, Bellarmin may be produced, who does not acknowledge that there is any decree of God connected with the death of Christ, by which God hath determined to give effectual or actually regenerating grace to

* William Estius, an eminent Dutch divine of the Roman communion; he was born at Gorcum, in Holland, about 1542. After he had finished his Classical studies at Utrecht, he studied Divinity and Philosophy at Louvain, where he taught those studies for ten years; and afterwards became Professor of Divinity in the University of Douay, was subsequently elected to the Chancellorship, and died there in 1613. He was equally distinguished for his learning, modesty, and benevolence. Of his numerous works, the following are most known, viz. 1. *Commentarii in quatuor libros Sententiarum.* Douai, 1615. 4 tomis, fol. Du Pin says that this is one of the best theological works of which the Roman Church can boast. 2. *Annotationes in præcipua difficiliora Scripturæ loca*, Antverpiæ, 1621, folio: of this work, which appears to have been highly esteemed, there were several Editions. 3. *In omnes B. Pauli et aliorum Apostolorum Epistolas Commentaria.* Douai, 1614, 2 tomis, folio. Du Pin commends this as one of the best works of the kind; but it appears that Estius was prevented by death from proceeding further than 1 John v., and that the rest of the Commentary was supplied by Bartholomew De la Pierre. (Vide *Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary*, and *Moreri.*)

all men on this condition, If they should not refuse it of their own will. (Lib. 1, de Grat. & lib. arbitr. cap. 12,) He rejects the opinion of those who *teach that it is in the power of men to make that grace effectual, which otherwise would not of itself be more than sufficient.* He shews that they oppose Augustine and the holy Scriptures, who say, that *all men would receive the grace of God, if those to whom it is not given did not refuse it of their own will.* (Page 423.) And further, he urges his opinion with this objection, *That if effectual calling did not depend on the purpose of God, but on human will, no room would be left for predestination.* To which may be added (lib. 1, cap. 1, p. 455,) *We believe that God of his absolute will will save many, both children and adults, and that of his absolute will he will not save others.* (See Augustini Enchiridion, cap. 102, 103.)

But to what purpose are so many testimonies concerning grace and free-will, when we are employed in explaining the question concerning the death of Christ, as far as it is considered as an universal cause of human salvation? Truly, because the Pelagians formerly taught, and many are now fallen into the same opinion, which asserts, That, through the death and merit of Christ the Redeemer, saving or effectual grace is equally set before all men, to be granted on this condition, If they should not refuse it of their own will; and is denied on this condition, If they should refuse it: as if the death of Christ had been granted to men of the pure mercy of God, but effectual or saving grace flowed to men according as they made a good or bad use of their free-will in exciting, embracing, or repelling grace, and *salvation was given to those who were willing to be saved from the fountain of their own willing*, as Prosper sang, (lib. de Ingratis, cap. 6.)

In this Dissertation then, concerning the universal efficacy of the death of Christ, as it was our design to shew, against those who endeavour to limit it, That it was a kind of universal covenant, established with the whole human race, concerning the giving of remission and eternal life to all men individually on condition of faith;—so it was also to be demonstrated, against those who extend this univer-

sal efficacy of the death of Christ beyond its proper limits, That no law, no decree was established, in the appointment of the death of Christ, concerning the giving of the means of supernatural grace, or concerning the giving of saving or effectual grace itself to all men on the condition, If they make a good or not a bad use of the light of nature; or on the condition, If of their own will they should not refuse it. Therefore, the death of Christ being granted, God is bound by his faithfulness, according to the covenant of the Gospel, to give remission of sins and eternal life to every one that believes and repents; but by no covenant is he bound to give faith itself, love, or saving grace to him that excels another in acting by the strength of his free-will. Moreover, the gift or denial of effectual and saving grace, the death of Christ being granted, remains as free to God, as the gift of Christ himself was, which is understood not to be due or given to any acts of the human will. Therefore the obtaining or not obtaining of effectual and saving grace, is to be referred in its first origin, to the purpose of God in shewing mercy and pity, or not shewing it; and not to the free-will of man choosing or not choosing. Hitherto we have disputed of the death of Christ as far as its virtue and efficacy pertains to all men. In what follows, we shall explain it as far as it is limited to the elect children of God.

CHAPTER VII.

OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST, AS IT REGARDS THE PREDESTINATED ALONE.

HITHERTO we have treated of the death of Christ as it regards the whole human race, in the universal circuit of his quickening power to be brought into act under the condition of faith, as to every man. For although, through the want of this condition, the death of Christ does not display its saving virtue in the greater part of men, yet it is not to be denied, that the Scriptures every where clearly testify, nor is it to be doubted, but God had in himself the most just and wise reasons of his counsel, while he determined that the death of his Son should be applicable to all men on condition of faith, and nevertheless did not determine to effect or procure that it should be applied to all by the gift of faith to each individual. We ought not, therefore, to oppose to each other and clash together these Divine decrees, *I will that my Son should so offer himself on the cross for the sins of the human race, that all men individually may be saved by believing in him*;—and—*I will so dispense my efficacious grace that not all, but the elect only, may receive this saving faith, whereby they may be saved.* If these two decrees seem to any one to oppose each other, he ought rather to acknowledge the weakness of his own understanding, than to deny any of those things which are so plainly contained in the holy Scriptures. Let this, then, be fixed and established, That according to the decree of God himself, Christ was so offered on the cross for all men, that his death is a kind of universal remedy appointed for all men individually, in order to obtain remission of sins and eternal life, to be applied by faith. But now, lest

under this universal virtue of the death of Christ, which extends to all rational creatures, we should destroy its special efficacy, which actually pertains to the predestinated alone, we shall enter upon the other part of the discussion we undertook, which will explain and defend the special prerogative of the elect in the death of Christ, both from the will of God the Father in giving his Son to death, and that of the Son in offering himself. For we ought not so to contend that Christ died for all, as to believe with the Pelagians, that the quickening efficacy of his death is at the same time common to all, from the intention of the Divine will, but in its event becomes saving to some and not to others, no otherwise than from the contingent use of human liberty. Nor are we to fancy with the Arminians, that God gave his Son to death *absolutely intending nothing more than that from thence he might have a mere power of saving some sinners, notwithstanding his justice, and that any sinners might have a way or means by which they might be saved, notwithstanding their own sin.* Hence arises that celebrated corollary of Grevinchovius,* in his dissertation on the death of Christ (p. 9,) *That the dignity, necessity, and usefulness of redemption might abundantly appear by its being obtained, even though it should never be actually applied to any individual.* Again (p. 14,) *That the redemption might be obtained for all, and yet applied to none on account of their unbelief.* But we by no means think that the death of Christ was like the cast of dice, but that it was decreed from eternity by God the Father

* To what has been observed respecting Grevinchovius at p. 304, it may be added, that he took an active part in the controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians in Holland. Besides various publications written in the Dutch Language, he wrote (in reply to William Ames's *Disceptatio Scholastica de Arminii sententiâ, quâ electionem omnem particularem fidei prævisæ docet inniti,* Amst. 1593, 4to.) *Dissertatio de duabus quæstionibus hoc tempore controversis ; quarum prima est de Reconciliatione per mortem Christi impetratâ omnibus et singulis hominibus : altera, de electione ex fide previsâ.* Roterodami, 1595, 4to. To this treatise Ames rejoined, as the Reader will have observed in the early part of the 4th Chapter of this Dissertation, in a *Rescriptio Scholastica*, published at Leyden, in 1597, 12mo. (*Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica*, tom. II. pp. 543, 544. 548, 549.)

and Christ, through the merit of his death, infallibly to save some certain persons whom the Scripture marks by the name of the elect; and therefore, that, according to the will of God, the death of Christ was, by some special mode and counsel, offered and accepted for their redemption. Nor is it here necessary, for the defence of this special counsel, to define that thorny question which has been tossed about by many, and vexed all who have undertaken to discuss it, viz. *Whether that decree was first, by which certain persons are predestinated to the infallible participation of eternal life; or the other, by which Christ was ordained to his mediatorial office.* For although, to sustain the weakness of the human understanding, we are compelled to conceive of some of the eternal decrees of God as prior and some as posterior, yet it seems to me a slippery and very dangerous thing to contend about these imaginary signs of our reason, as to undertake to establish and to refute from them questions of faith. It ought, indeed, to be placed beyond all doubt, that those decrees of God, which are thought of by us according to the order of prior and posterior, with respect to God himself consist of an equable eternity of infinity; neither can or ought any separate moment to be granted, in which one decree having been established, it can be rightly supposed, that the other is not yet foreseen and established. Conceive, therefore, that first in order was the decree of God concerning the appointment and sending of a Mediator (which seems to me more suited to our mode of understanding,) and that afterwards was the decree concerning the choice of certain persons to the infrustrable attainment of eternal life through the appointed Mediator; yet you can never so separate these, as that the passion of the Mediator would not have been foreseen from eternity, as offered in some special way and regard for those persons who were to be chosen, and accepted as if it were offered by God for them specially, and that from eternity. On the other hand, conceive that first in order was the decree concerning the election of certain persons to salvation; that afterwards was the decree concerning the destination of Christ to the office of Me-

diator, yet you could never so separate these, as that the passion of Christ, which was specially offered and accepted for them, should not be the cause of preparing and giving to those elect persons both effectual grace and salvation. Since, therefore, both these opinions are the same for our purpose, we shall dismiss the discussion of a thing so very unnecessary, and propose and confirm one thesis only respecting the death of Christ as limited by some special consideration to the predestinated alone; which is as follows,

The death of Christ, from the special design of God the Father, who from eternity ordained and accepted that sacrifice; and of Christ, who offered it in the fulness of time to God the Father; was destined for some certain persons, whom the Scripture calls the elect, and for them alone, so as to be effectually and infallibly applied to the obtaining of eternal life.

We oppose this proposition to the error of the Arminians, which Grevinchovius endeavours to establish, (Dissert. de morte Christi, p. 7) where he teaches that God, delivering up his Son, intended the obtaining of a reconciliation common to all men individually, but did not absolutely will the application of it, when obtained, to any of the children of men. *I acknowledge,* says he, *in God indeed a constant and perpetual desire of applying to all men individually the good obtained; but I deny that the application itself was destined by the certain counsel and will of God for any man but him that believeth.* This modern innovator, then, thinks that God equally willed eternal life in Christ to all men, and that he did not, by his absolute and antecedent will, destine and prepare for any effectual grace, whereby Christ might be infallibly applied to them; but that, by his eternal foreknowledge, he foresaw that some would believe, and some would remain in unbelief, and then at length destined to believers, as such, an effectual application of the death and merits of Jesus Christ. But we think, that, in predestination to faith, the application of the death of Christ was infallibly destined for some certain persons; and we say that this faith is not prepared for

believers, as such, but for unbelievers, that through it they may become believers. The application therefore, which is not destined, but made, is understood as regarding men who are considered as believers; but the application which is destined, is understood as regarding those to whom faith is destined to be given, by which this application may be made. But these are the elect, and the elect alone; whose special prerogative it is, that according to the absolute will of God the Father and of Christ the Mediator, they are decreed and caused to be infallibly saved through the death of Christ.

These things having been premised, let us proceed to our argument, and in the first place treat of the clear testimonies of the Scriptures.

1. To this purport, in the first place, are those passages which mention the absolute will of the Father with respect to giving, and, as it were, commending certain persons to the Mediator, with the design that from him and through him they may receive all things necessary to salvation, and at length salvation itself. (John vi. 37, 39,) *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out; and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing,* &c. It is evident from the context, that not all men promiscuously, but some persons in particular, were given to the Mediator by the mercy of God the Father, according to a certain gracious purpose of infallibly and effectually bringing these persons to eternal life. A similar passage is (John xvii. 2) *Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.* This special giving cannot be understood to have been done otherwise than in eternal election. But no one can justly doubt that those who were thus given to the Redeemer, have a special prerogative in the work of redemption. Certainly, the Apostle has plainly signified it in Ephes. i. 4, 5, 6, &c. *According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world,* &c. *having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his*

will, &c. Here you have the special gift of certain persons known to God alone. Then in verse 7 it is shewn, that according to the purpose of God, the same persons always obtain that redemption which is effectually applied through the Mediator, *In whom we have redemption through his blood*, &c. Those, therefore, who are specially given to Christ by election, always derive faith, remission of sins, sanctification, and salvation from the death of Christ, or the beneficial application of his being given to them, at the same time. St. Augustine understood nothing else than eternal election by this giving. (In Johan. tract. 107) He says, *The Father would not have given them to the Son, unless he had elected them.* And (De prædest. Sanctor. cap. 16) he demonstrates, that those who were thus given to the Son, were also called in such a peculiar manner, that Christ crucified should not become to them a stumbling-block or foolishness, but the power and wisdom of God, effectually to work in them faith and salvation. See the words of the Author, which I omit for the sake of brevity. Therefore, it must either be denied that some certain persons were specially given to Christ the Mediator by God the Father, or it must at the same time be confessed that the Mediator had a special regard to them in his offering.

2. Secondly, the same is evinced by those passages which teach that Christ, conscious of the will of the Father, by his special care directs and infallibly brings to salvation the aforesaid persons who were specially given to him. Which would not be done beyond doubt, unless the death of Christ, which is the meritorious cause of all-saving grace granted to us, had been by some special design destined for these persons, as saving and quickening them. But let us observe the words of Scripture, (John xvii. 9) *I pray for them, I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given me, for they are thine.* And ver. 12, *Those that thou gavest me I have kept.* And ver. 19, *For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.* Nothing is more clear than that two things are affirmed in these passages; First, That not all men promiscuously, but some persons especially, were given by

God the Father to Christ the Mediator, which it has been shewn is to be understood of the elect. Secondly, That Christ in discharging his office of Mediator and Saviour, embraces and regards them with a special love, attention, and care, that is, with such love, attention, and care as may produce in them the infallible effect of eternal life. Which manifestly appears from Heb. ii. 13, where Christ represents to his Father that those children who had been given to him by his Father were preserved and saved, *Behold, I and the children which God hath given me.* Now that we may bring all these things into a small compass, Those whom Christ commended to the Father by special intercession, that is, *by absolute prayer*, as Bannes expresses it (in 1, qu. 23, art. 5, p. 297,) or as Suares says (in 3, tom. 1, quæst. 19, disp. 31, p. 634,) for whom he prayed *with an effectual and absolute will, that the merit of his death might be effectually applied to them;* for the preserving and keeping of whom he watched in an extraordinary manner; for whom he so sanctified himself, that they might effectually receive from him that sanctification which is produced in the hearts of those who are saved by the doctrine of the Gospel, and moreover, whom he will place altogether at length before his Father safe and glorious: these persons, beyond all controversy, he also embraced with a special design in the very act of his offering, and so likewise in the whole work of redemption. For it is absurd to say, that by a special design, salvation was procured by the Mediator for those persons for whom the death of Christ, which is the cause of the salvation of mankind, was not destined by a special design.

3. A third argument is derived from those Scriptures in which the death of Christ, when joined, and as it were connected with his certain and absolute purpose of giving eternal life, is not extended to all men, but is limited to certain persons, and that according to the special design of Christ himself. Such as (John x. 15) *I lay down my life for the sheep.* (John xi. 51, 52) *He prophesied that Jesus should die,* &c. *that he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.* (Ephes. v. 25, 26)

Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, &c. (Tit. ii. 14) *Jesus Christ gave himself for us, that he might purify unto himself a peculiar people,* &c. (Acts xx. 28) *Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* (Ephes. i. 22, 23) *He gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.* (Eph. v. 23) *Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Saviour of the body.* In all these passages three things are to be observed: first, That by the names of *sheep, the church, the children of God, the body of Christ,* are intended the sheep, the children of God, and members of Christ, not as actually united to him by faith already received, but as by the counsel and design of God to be united by faith to be received. Secondly, That the whole human race promiscuously cannot be meant by these titles. Thirdly, When it is said that Christ died *that he might gather together in one these children of God, that he might sanctify this church, that he might purchase this church,* &c. there is not denoted in Christ's offering himself an ineffectual will, or some conditional design, which might fail of the intended effect; but an effectual will and design joined with an infallible event. It is proved in the *first* place, That his discourse in the passages aforesaid, is concerning his sheep, his members, his children considered according to the eternal and secret purpose of Divine election, and not according to their actual present state; Because no one actually becomes a sheep of Christ, a child of God, a member of his mystical body, except by the merit and benefit of the death of Christ actually and effectually derived and applied to him: therefore, Christ died for the sheep, for the children of God, for the church, for the members destined for him from eternity according to the purpose of election, namely, that by the merit of the death of Christ this predestination of God might be accomplished in them. Thus Augustine says (in Johan. tract. 46,) *The Lord knoweth them that are his; they are his sheep, according to his predestination, according to his foreknowledge, according to his election*

of the sheep, before the formation of the world. And (Tract 49, page 366) he thus speaks of the children of God that were scattered abroad. *These things are said according to predestination: For they were not as yet the sheep or the children of God, because they had not yet believed.* It is proved, *Secondly*, That in the passages alleged, the death of Christ is said to be limited to certain persons for some special reason. For otherwise why would the Scripture have mentioned *sheep, children*, or *the church*, if it wished to mark that it is extended to all? It would have been in vain to make use of words which describe a small part of the human race, unless it had also shewn that the design of Christ in this thing did not regard the whole human race, but referred to those few only. The death of Christ, and the design of God embracing all mankind promiscuously is excellently expressed, John iii. 16, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.* But he so loved his sheep, his children, his church, that he determined by his death effectually to derive to them faith and eternal life. As often as the holy Scripture makes mention of the death of Christ in reference alone to the church, the sheep, the members of his mystical body, it would unfold to us the special design of Christ in offering himself, arising from his special love; according as Aquinas says (Part. 3, qu. 24, art. 4,) *God fore-ordained the salvation of the elect, by predestinating from eternity, that it should be accomplished through Jesus Christ.* It is proved, *Thirdly*, That in the passages aforesaid, it is shewn that the will of God the Father and of Christ, concerning the salvation of the sheep by the death of Christ, is not ineffectual or conditional, but absolute and effectual; Because Christ speaking of the same sheep, says, (John x. 28) *I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish:* and (John xvii. 24) *Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am.* And (Eph. v. 23) the Apostle says of that church for which Christ gave himself, *Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Saviour of the body.* These passages all express an absolute will joined with its effect.

Therefore Christ is truly called the Saviour and Redeemer of the world, inasmuch as he hath brought to the whole world a saving remedy, which is applicable by faith. But he is the Saviour and Redeemer of his sheep, his church, his body, in short, of the predestinated children of God, inasmuch as by his special design he hath destined and procured this remedy to be applied to them, by granting to them that *the eyes of their understanding should be enlightened* (Eph. i. 18,) that by faith they might possess Christ effectually united and applied to them.

4. Lastly, we may confirm our opinion by those passages in which God hath absolutely promised to Christ, on his dying, that by the merit of his death the church should be infallibly delivered from death, and put in possession of eternal life. (Gen. iii. 15) *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.* What else does this mean, but that by the virtue and merit of the death of Christ, Satan should be trodden down, and all those should be delivered from his power whom God in Christ willed specially to pity? Now who can doubt that Christ, by a special design, referred his death, which was to destroy Satan, to those who, by a special benefit, were to be delivered through him? But that those who were infallibly to be delivered were the elect, is allowed by all sound Divines. Rupert (lib. 2, de victoria Verbi Dei, cap. 18) says, *He calls the elect by name the conquerors of the serpent;* because, truly, the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ to bruise the devil is of his special mercy destined and procured to be effectually applied to them alone. From whence Marloratus* says on this passage, *The devil and the generation of*

* Augustine Marlorat, an eminent Protestant divine of the 16th century, was born in the dukedom of Lorrain in 1506. Having made great proficiency in his studies, in a Monastery of Augustine Friars, whose licentious morals appear to have inspired him with a dislike for their religion, he quitted that monastery, and pursued his studies first in France, and afterwards at Lausanne, where he made open profession of the Protestant religion, and was admitted into the Ministry. He was chosen pastor at Vevey, and then at Rouen, in Normandy, where he contributed to the diffusion of the principles of the Reformation. In 1561, he was present at the memorable conference held at Poissy between Beza and the Cardinal of

the wicked fight against the elect of God; but the elect at length come off the victors, on account of their head, even Christ, who by his death hath destroyed him that had the power of death. Therefore the death of Christ was specially intended and destined to bruise Satan under the feet of the elect, and effectually to save them, and that according to the most sure promise of God himself. A promise not dissimilar of God the Father concerning the efficacy of the death of Christ as to the elect, is contained in Isaiah liii. 10, 11. The words are these, *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand; he shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied,* &c. In these words God the Father promises to the Son, that his passion and death should not be useless or without fruit, but a seed should undoubtedly be brought forth to him. I ask then, whether this promise regards vague and uncertain individuals, or certain persons specifically known to God the Father and Christ the Mediator? Without doubt it would be most unworthy of Divine perfection and wisdom

Lorrain, in which he distinguished himself by his ability and zeal in defence of the Protestant cause. In the following year the civil wars broke out in France; and, Rouen being taken, Montmorency, Constable of France, threw Marlorat into prison, on the false charge of being a seducer of the people. On this charge, *of which* NO *proofs were brought*, he was condemned to be hanged, his head then to be set upon a pole on the bridge of the city, and his property confiscated. He accordingly suffered Oct. 30, 1562, in the 56th year of his age. He wrote Commentaries on Genesis, Job, the book of Psalms, and the Song of Solomon, and on the prophecies of Isaiah; and a book of Common Places. But his greatest work is entitled, *Novi Testamenti Catholica Expositio Ecclesiastica*, of which there were not fewer than *nine* Editions between the years 1561 and 1604. It was formerly held in the highest estimation, and deservedly so: it contains Erasmus's Latin Version of the New Testament, and the Expositions are collected with singular industry and ability from the works of the early Ecclesiastical writers as well as from modern Protestant Interpreters and Commentators, with which the Author has interwoven his own judicious remarks. English translations of his Exposition of the Psalms and of the Gospels of St. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and of the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, were published at London during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. (*Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary*, Vol. XXI. p. 332. *Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica*, Vol. II. pp. 414. 606.)

to form a confused promise concerning the salvation of some persons, who were not then specifically marked out by God himself. But if a determination were made by God and Christ concerning the effectual salvation of this seed through the death of Christ, it would follow, that there had been an effectual and specific design with regard to their salvation, in the death of Christ. All the interpreters of this passage have so understood it, as to allow that by the death of Christ a most effectual and most certain deliverance and salvation was promised to his mystical body, that is, the church, or the elect. Thus Luther says, *The posterity or seed of which he speaks, is the church.* HE SHALL SEE HIS SEED, *that is, he shall have a kingdom and royal children.* So Calvin observes, HE SHALL SEE HIS SEED, *signifies that the death of Christ would be the cause of begetting an offspring, because having died and risen again, he should acquire to himself a peculiar people.* Musculus does not disagree when explaining the words, *He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied. Christ saw beforehand the flowing together of the elect to be saved; he sees it even now, and he shall see it to the end of the world; and he is satisfied with seeing it, because the pleasure of God his Father prospers in his hand.* These all agree that, according to the special good pleasure of God the Father, the effectual salvation of the church, that is, of some certain persons known to God alone, was promised to Christ, as the fruit of his passion; and that Christ intended with a specific and effectual will, and laboured for the salvation of these elect persons, or this peculiar people individually given and commended to him by God the Father.

OBJECTION. If any one should object with Grevinchovius, (Dissert. de morte Chr. p. 8 and 14) *That there was not any absolute promise or will of God concerning the effectual redemption of any individual persons, but that God willed or did not will the application of the death of Christ to all men individually not absolutely but conditionally; He willed it to all if they had faith; he did not will it if they disbelieved: and therefore, although Christ laid down his life, it was possible nevertheless that his death might not be applied to any;*

that is, it was possible that he might be defrauded of his promised seed, on account of the unbelief of all men intervening.

REPLY. I answer, that in this promise, by which God the Father as it were bound himself to the Mediator, to give him a seed, if he should lay down his soul for sin, a tacit promise is contained of giving faith to the elect, without which they would not be the seed of Christ. It was therefore decreed by God on account of the death of his Son, to give faith to some persons, as well as to give a progeny to his Son which should live for ever. Christ being aware beforehand of this promise and counsel, could not offer the sacrifice of his death to God the Father, without a special design for this seed, who should hereafter believe in him.—So far we have contended from express testimonies of the Scriptures; let us now bring forward some arguments founded also in the holy Scriptures.

ARGUMENT 1. He who by his death not only established the evangelical covenant which regards all men promiscuously, *Whosoever believeth shall be saved;* but also that secret covenant which comprehends some certain individual persons known only to God, and which is described by the Prophet (Jerem. xxxi. 33) in these words, *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people;* He who by his death procured such a covenant, offered his death and merit to God the Father that it might be effectually applied to some elect persons. This proposition is clear and evident, because *to put his laws into the minds of men, and to write them in their hearts, and to make them a peculiar people to God,* denotes an effectual application of the merits of Christ, and describes the privileges of the elect, or the spiritual Israel. Now I add the minor, and affirm, That Christ, by his death, is the Mediator of this secret covenant, which includes its application, and embraces the Israel of God, or the elect children of God, and them alone. Besides the words of the prophet just quoted, we have also the clear testimony of the Apostle, citing the same prophet, (Heb. viii. 6) *Our*

High Priest is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. But what are those better promises which Christ the Mediator hath established? They are recounted verse 10, in the words which are recorded by Jeremiah, and are divided into two heads, into a promise of *inward reformation of the hearts,* and of *gratuitous remission of sins,* as Calvin has well observed on this passage. Christ therefore, by his death, hath merited remission of sins for all, if they should believe and be converted; but he hath merited and procured for some, that this gratuitous and secret covenant should be fulfilled by God who hath promised it, namely, that they should believe and be converted by God's effectually reforming their hearts through and on account of the Mediator, and putting his laws in them. But these persons for whom Christ hath merited this are (as Bede hath observed from Augustine) *all pertaining spiritually to the house of Israel and the seed of Abraham;* and what else is this but all the elect? Therefore the elect according to the intention of God and Christ, have the special benefit of a profitable application, on account of the death of Christ, both destined for and presented to them.

ARGUMENT 2, May be drawn from the consideration of the price paid on the cross for the redemption of the human race. This price was the blood of the Son of God, of the only begotten and beloved Son. But it is not to be believed, that such and so great a price was paid for an event dependent on the uncertain determination of the human will: Therefore it was the design and intention of God the Father and Christ the Mediator infallibly and effectually to redeem and to save some men by this precious death. But these could not be any others than those who are really saved, that is, than the elect: Therefore the intention of Christ in offering himself regarded the elect in some special manner. I know that Grevinchovius and others of the same school, boldly assert, (Dissert. de mort. Chr. p. 14, 15) *That the proper end obtained and designed by God was, that the sinner might be saved, notwithstanding his justice; but that this redemption, although obtained for all,*

might possibly be applied to none, on account of the intervention of the unbelief of all. Which is the same as if they should say, that God so gave his Son to death, that at the same time he had no certain purpose of saving any men by the merit of his death ; but having procured the bare possibility of salvation, through the death of Christ, for all men generally, he committed the effectual participation of salvation to the free-will of each individual, so that the death of Christ, considered in the whole latitude of its merit, could not have effectually redeemed any one from death. But whoever rightly considers how precious the death of the Son was in the eyes of the Father, could not think that he would have been willing to expose his Son to death, without a certain purpose of effectually applying his death to some persons. (Isa. liii. 10) *The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.* Hear what Malderus says, a Popish writer, but much sounder in this matter than the Arminians. (Anti Synod. p. 138,) *If the offering alone be regarded, it is equally for all ; but it is otherwise, if that should be regarded, for the actual obtaining of which he offered himself. For he obtained for the elect the perfect benefit of his passion actually following and applied, as though they were given to him by the Father for this purpose.* The blood of Christ, then, could not flow in vain, because by the price of his blood, according to the decree of God, he merited for the elect the beneficial application of that price.

ARGUMENT 3. Whatever of spiritual and saving good the Spirit of Christ produces in any persons, the blood-shedding of Christ merited it for them : But the Spirit of Christ produces in some certain persons repentance and faith, and through faith and repentance the infallible application of his death : Therefore he merited these special benefits for those persons : Therefore he intended to merit them when he made himself a sacrifice on the cross. Nor is it lawful to think rashly or by chance, That Christ procured greater spiritual benefits for some than for others. What will our opponents say to this ? Will they say that

the Spirit of Christ bestows benefits on man which Christ hath not merited for them? They will not dare so to trample upon the merit of Christ. Will they reply, That faith and a good will, and the act of a beneficial application, are not the special gifts of the Holy Spirit? They will be ashamed of such gross Pelagianism. Let them, then, confess with us, That as through the death of Christ special benefits are procured for the elect, so there was in the will of Christ in dying, and of God the Father in accepting his death, an effectual intention of procuring and conferring them. And this is that singular privilege in the death of Christ which we claim for the elect alone; because it appears from the fact, that God has destined that they alone should be effectually saved by the death of his Son. From whence (Heb. vii. 25) he is stated to be the Saviour of some, that is, of the elect, altogether, viz. both meritoriously and efficaciously.

ARGUMENT 4. The commonly received distinction among all Divines, by which it is said, That Christ died for all *sufficiently*, but for the elect *effectually*, will afford us a fourth argument. For as from the former part of it we have refuted the opinion of those who deny that the death of Christ, according to the decree of God, is a remedy effectually and infallibly to be applied to the elect: for what other sense can there be of these words, *He died effectually for the elect*, than, He died with an absolute intention and effectual will of saving the elect? For if any one perverts this distinction, as if the sense were, That the death of Christ, which is sufficient for all, becomes eventually efficacious to some from the contingent act of the human will, in the first place, he is refuted by the words themselves; since when it is said, *Christ died for such and such persons effectually*, we denote a singular efficacy proceeding from the special will of him that died, not flowing from the contingent act of him that believes. *Secondly*, Such an eventual efficacy is not understood even by the Jesuits themselves in this distinction, but an efficacy specially intended and merited by him that died. Thus

Suares says,* (In 3, disp. 41, p. 629) *Christ hath not merited remission of sins for all men as to its efficacy, because he hath not applied his merit so that all men should infallibly obtain such an effect.* Therefore, *to merit effectually*, or *as to its efficacy*, is to apply his merit to some persons with that intention, that they should infallibly obtain from it the effect of eternal life. He says a little more plainly, (p. 635) *The merit of Christ equally regards all men as to its sufficiency, not as to its efficiency; which is to be understood not only on account of the effect, which is produced in one and not in another, but also on account of the will, by which Christ himself offered his merits in a different way for different persons.* Thirdly, all those testimonies of the Scriptures which set before us the death of Christ connected with the certain purpose of *redeeming his sheep, gathering together the children of God, purchasing the church, cleansing and preserving a peculiar people*, and others of that kind beforementioned, plainly shew that this efficacy of which Divines speak, is to be entirely separated from the will of Christ in dying, and not to be sought from the contingent act of the human will. Christ, by some special application of his

* SUARES or SUAREZ (Francis), a learned theologian, born at Grenada, in Spain, in 1548. After having completed his education as a law student at Salamanca, he entered into the Society of the Jesuits, who employed him to teach philosophy at Segovia, and he subsequently occupied the Chairs of theology at Valladolid, Rome, Alcala, and Salamanca. The first Professorship in the University of Coimbra becoming vacant, it was bestowed on Suares by Philip II. at the request of the heads of that Institution. He took an active part in the disputes which originated from the Theological doctrine of Father Molina, on the subject of Grace, which Suares endeavoured to explain by means of the principle termed "Congruism." He published a work against our King, James I., in defence of the Roman faith, for which he received the public thanks of the Pope and the King of Spain; but the book was prohibited in England and France, and ordered to be burnt in London by the common hangman. His death took place in Sept. 1617, at Lisbon, whither he had gone to be present at Conferences to be held before the Legate of the Holy See. His works, extending to twenty-three Volumes folio, were published at Mentz and Lyons, 1630, &c. and reprinted at Venice in 1740. His "Tractatus de Legibus, ac Deo Legislatore," esteemed his best work, was printed in London, 1679, folio. An abridgment of the works of Suares, by Father Noel, appeared at Geneva, 1732, two Vols. folio.—*Moreri.*—*Biog. Univ.*

offering, obtained that it should be rendered effectual to the elect; but the elect did not render it effectual to themselves by any special apprehension flowing from their own free-will.

ARGUMENT 5. We shall take our fifth argument from the Divine predestination. Since, the predestination of certain persons before the foundation of the world being admitted, it is necessary to admit that in the will of Christ in offering himself there was some regard and respect to their salvation to be produced by the merit of his passion. For whether we place the Divine election (according to our mode of understanding it) before the decree of his suffering, or place it afterwards, yet it will always remain firm, that in the will of Christ, whether as about to suffer, or as suffering, there was some effectual and singular intention of effectually saving these persons, whether elected or to be elected. Since the will of Christ is never without conformity to that of his Father: Therefore it is *incredible* (as Suares hath rightly remarked, in 3. disp. 31, § 2, p. 635) *that Christ did not otherwise offer his merits for those whom he knew to be elected by his Father than for others, since he saw that it was the will of the Father that they should be infallibly saved, and not the others; and to his will he conformed himself in all things.* To this also refer the words of the prophet before quoted (Isa. liii. 10,) *The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.* Therefore, the election of some persons to eternal life, which proceeds from the gratuitous will of God, is put in execution through the merits of Christ, and therefore it is not to be doubted, that the meritorious death of Christ was specially and effectually destined by the Redeemer himself, and offered to the Father for the infallible redemption and salvation of these elect persons. Excellent is the observation of Scotus on this passage, (lib. 3, dist. 19, p. 74) *Christ saw beforehand that his passion was to be offered to the Father for the predestinated and elect, and thus in reality he offered it effectually; and the whole Trinity thus effectually accepted it on their behalf, and for no others was it effectually offered or accepted from eternity.* By *effectual offering and acceptance* he means nothing

more than that the offering and acceptance was joined with an absolute purpose of saving those for whom it was offered and accepted in this manner. Malderus, Bishop of Antwerp, relying on this argument, rejects the contrary opinion of those who think that Christ died for all equally as to the efficacy of his death, and concludes thus (page 137,)* *Predestination being supposed, it follows, that Christ conferred by his death much more on these predestinated persons than on others.*

ARGUMENT 6. Sixthly, we may argue from that proposition which is to be retained between the offering of Christ for men, and his prayer or intercession for them. That Christ prayed or interceded with his Father for the elect, that they might retain a firm and invincible faith to the last, and might effectually obtain salvation, may be collected from John xvii., and from his prayer offered for Peter by name, *that his faith should not fail.* And truly, he who should deny that the excellent gift of perseverance was obtained for particular persons by the special prayer of Christ, would refer the greatest of all spiritual benefits to the acceptance of free-will. This being admitted, I will add, As Christ specially prayed for special benefits to be conferred on the elect, so he specially offered up himself in order to merit the same benefits. Of this special prayer and oblation Suares says (in 3, disp. 41, p. 635,) *As Christ prayed for men in a different way, so he merited differently; on which account, although he is the universal Redeemer of all men, and a sufficient cause of salvation, yet in a special way he is the effectual cause of salvation to those whom*

* MALDERUS, or JOHN MALDER, who was first a Doctor in Theology and Regius Professor in the University of Louvain, was nominated Bishop of Antwerp by the Governors of the Low Countries, and on the 7th of August, 1611, took possession of his See, over which he presided 22 years, and died at Antwerp, Oct. 21st, 1633. He is said to have been a man of singular modesty and learning. Besides treatises on Confession, and on the abuses of Mental Restrictions, he wrote, what he called, a Refutation of the Synod of Dort, (vide p. 527) a Commentary on the Song of Solomon, Theological Meditations, and several Volumes of Commentaries on the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. (*Richard et Giraud, Bibliothèque Sacrée*, tom II. p. 381, et tom. XV. p. 493.)

he makes obedient to himself. Therefore the prayer which Christ specially and effectually put up for the elect, had its foundation in the oblation, in which he specially and effectually offered up himself for them. Observe the force of the argument; Whatever Christ obtains for individual persons by his special intercession, that he merited for them with the Father by the offering of himself which pertained to them especially: But by his intercession he obtains for the elect faith, perseverance, and salvation itself: Therefore he specially offered himself for them, that he might infallibly procure for them these benefits. *I doubt not* (says Vasques, in 1, qu. 23, art. 5, disp. 94, cap. 3,) *that Christ by his peculiar prayer and will applied his merits to those who were predestinated and elected.*

ARGUMENT 7. The death and merit of Christ is the mean ordained by God for the execution and accomplishment of the eternal counsel of God concerning the salvation of men. If, therefore, the will of God shews itself differently in effecting the salvation of men, then also the death of Christ will be differently disposed by it in the salvation of men, and will be differently applied; since means are always used in order to the end, and the mode of application will be according to the intention of the agent. Now it is certain, and admitted by all sound Divines, That God does not will the salvation of all, in the same way as he wills the salvation of some: Therefore, neither hath he willed that the means by which he hath determined that the salvation of mankind is to be procured, namely, the death of Christ, should be so applied to all as to some. Whence it follows, that the death of Christ was so destined for those to whom God hath determined salvation by his effectual will, that by the merit of it, all things necessary infallibly to produce salvation should redound to them from it. And, on the other hand, to those whom he hath not decreed salvation by such a will, neither was the death of Christ destined for them in the same manner. The death of Christ, therefore, according to the special intention of God the Father, who ordained this sacrifice for the salvation of men, and of Christ, who offered up

himself in conformity to the will of the Father, is understood to have been destined and applied to the elect, whom God hath determined infallibly to save by his death, in a different way from its application to others, whom God permits, notwithstanding this death, to perish through their own fault. Whoever denies that the death of Christ was offered for men, and that it is applied to them with this difference, may by the same means deny that God, who is most wise and most powerful, either knows not how or cannot design and accommodate differently to various persons the means which were instituted by himself, as the different manner of his will demands.

ARGUMENT 8. It is certain from the event that some men apply to themselves the death of Christ, with its infinite merit, really and effectually for salvation. I ask, then, whether this application is made according to the antecedent and effectual intention of Christ in offering himself on the cross, or contrary to it, or without any such preceding intention? If it should be granted, that Christ in dying had an antecedent and special will concerning the effectual application, which pertains to all the elect, and to them alone, this is the very thing we are endeavouring to prove, namely, that this death was destined, according to the special intention of God and Christ, to be effectually applied to the elect. But no man would say, that any person can effectually apply this death to himself contrary to the intention of Christ. There is but one thing remaining, viz. We say that this effectual application is made by some men according to the freedom of their own will, without any special, preceding, absolute, and effectual intention of the will of God. But religion forbids us to assert this: *First*, because in good and saving actions the effectual will of God is antecedent to the effectual will of man, *For it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure*, (Philip. ii. 13) and he doth not work any thing in us antecedently which he hath not antecedently determined to work. *Secondly*, because in those works which pertain to salvation we can do nothing without Christ, (John xv. 5,) *Without me ye can do nothing.*

But what we can do through Christ, we receive the power of doing on account of the merit of Christ, which is not given to any man without the antecedent and special intention of Christ, who died and merited it. Therefore, whoever has obtained this most excellent benefit, that he should have the merit of Christ applied to himself effectually, ought to confess, that he has received the power of applying it more than others, from the special kindness of God and Christ, who intended, destined, and applied this his own merit especially to that person. Thus the event of the beneficial application of it in the predestinated, demonstrates that there was in Christ, who offered himself, and in God, who accepted this sacrifice, a special and effectual intention of its application to the predestinated. And this is that singular privilege of the elect in the death of Christ which we have endeavoured to establish by our proposition.

Argument 9. If it is asserted, that the death of Christ, according to the appointment of God and the intention of Christ, has not merited the effectual application and infallible attainment of salvation which flows from it to those who are predestinated, it will improperly follow, that the merit of the Mediator, according to the will and intention of the Father who accepted it, and of the Son who exhibited it, did not more regard those who are elected than those who are passed by, but pertains equally to both. The consequence is plain, because it is evident, That according to the will of God, the merit of Christ in dying extends itself to all men on this condition, If they should apply it to themselves by faith. Therefore, unless Christ had intended by his death to merit for the elect, in addition, that the beneficial application should be made to them by faith being given to them, no special privilege would be given to them in the merit of Christ. For the death of Christ, according to the appointment of God, merited this for Judas, that on the condition of faith he might attain to eternal life; but it obtained in addition for Peter, that on account of the merit of Christ he should receive persevering faith and all other spiritual benefits

which are required in order infallibly to obtain eternal life. And to this the reasoning of the Apostle has respect (Rom. viii. 32,) where he discourses of the privileges of those who are predestinated, *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* In which passage as he had before intimated some special calling of the predestined, which he named *a calling according to purpose*, so also he marks some special oblation of Christ for these predestinated persons, which may be called *an oblation according to purpose*, that is, with a certain purpose of conferring effectual grace on the elect, and infallibly leading them to life by the merit of this death. Those who take away this distinction in the design of God, as to the death of Christ, considered in relation to those who are elected and those who are passed by, as Bannes truly says (in 1, quæst. 23, art. 5, p. 296, 297,) *Declare that the merit of Christ is in no degree more perfect as a cause of salvation to the predestinate than to the reprobate. Because, as to the sufficiency of his merit, it equally regards all men; but the difference is in this, that his merit is applied to some, but not to others. Therefore if the application as to the elect is not derived from the merit of Christ, his merit will have an equal regard to the predestinate and the reprobate.*

ARGUMENT 10. If Christ did not offer himself to God the Father with some peculiar and absolute will of redeeming and effectually saving the elect by the merit of his death, then effectual grace and eternal life would not be otherwise prepared for or given to any persons in Christ than it was in Adam. For the possibility of having grace and eternal life on a condition depending upon our free-will, was granted to the human race through the first Adam. If, therefore, Christ did not by his death merit grace and life for any persons absolutely, but for all promiscuously, on this uncertain condition, *If they should receive grace offered, and believe in him, and persevere in faith*, and at the same time commits and leaves to the free-will of each whether he is willing to believe and to persevere or not, truly, as to the manner and uncertainty of obtaining

effectual grace and eternal life, we should be in no better condition through Christ, than we were by Adam. But this is opposite to the holy Scripture, which suspends grace and eternal life, as prepared and given through Christ, to all who are to be saved, on the certain purpose of the good pleasure of God, and not on the contingent motion of the human will; which is shewn in the controversy concerning election and preterition. It is opposite also to the opinion of the orthodox Fathers, who opposed the Pelagians, and especially that of Augustine (de corrept. & grat. cap. 11,) where, when he had shewn what that grace was which was given in the first Adam, he speaks thus concerning the grace prepared and given through Christ to the predestinated: *So much more help of grace is given by Jesus Christ, to those to whom it hath pleased God to give it, that not only that is bestowed without which we cannot stand, even if we would, but also so much and such grace is bestowed, that we are willing. There is truly in us, through this grace of God, not only power to do what we will in receiving and perseveringly retaining the benefit, but also power to will what we are enabled to do.* This grace, which is given for Christ's sake to the elect alone, and which produces in them alone the effect of a beneficial application and salvation, does not flow to them from any special operation of the human will, but from the special decree of the Divine will, through the medium of the merit of Christ. Therefore the merit of Christ was in some special way destined for them by God, and is applied to them by Christ himself.

ARGUMENT 11. That opinion is to be rejected by us which is either altogether the same, or at least is closely allied with the condemned opinion of the Pelagians: but the opinion of those who assert that the death of Christ, as to the Divine will and intention, is equally the same to all as to its efficacy, but that it arises from the human will that it is eventually effectual and beneficial to some, comes as near as possible to Pelagius. But the orthodox having been stirred up to an accurate consideration of this thing by Pelagius, always taught, on the contrary, That a bene-

ficial or effectual application of the merits of Christ depends on the grace of predestination, by which faith and a good will is mercifully conferred upon some, though not others by the just judgment of God. As to Pelagius, that he transferred the benefit of the death of Christ, that is, eternal life, from the special intention of God, to the special operation of the human will, appears from the epistle of Prosper to Augustine. It appears also from the epistle of Hilary to Augustine, in which the Remnants of the Pelagians express their opinion that eternal life is so proposed and set before all men, through the death of Christ, that they altogether deny any singular or special purpose of God concerning the salvation of the elect through the death of Christ, and refer to the human will the whole distinction between those who are saved through the death of Christ, and those who are not saved. But, on the other hand, that the orthodox acknowledged a special and secret purpose of God in accepting the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of Christ in offering it, concerning its effectual and beneficial application to certain persons, is not less evident from the books of Augustine, On the predestination of the saints, On the benefit of perseverance, and others written against the Pelagians and Semipelagians; in which this conclusion concerning the special will of God in saving the elect through Christ, is the primary, if not the only one. The same may be said of Prosper and Fulgentius, who every where refer the effectual obtaining of salvation to the effectual and special will of God in destining Christ in a special manner to the elect, and not to the free-will of men in applying the death and merits of Christ to themselves, as it may happen.

ARGUMENT 12. But lest we should seem to contend with empty names, our last argument is derived from the express testimonies of the Fathers, and of modern writers, who assign to the predestinated a special prerogative in the death of Christ; which is nothing else than an infallible attainment of grace and glory, according to the special appointment of God, derived from the merit of Christ in

dying and offering himself with a special regard for them. And first from St. Augustine:

TEST. 1. This is an eminent testimony (in Johan. tract. 48, p. 352, tom. 9,) *How did he say to them, Ye are not of my sheep? Because he saw that they were predestinated to eternal perdition, not purchased with the price of his blood to eternal life.* A little after, *Of those sheep, neither the wolf seizes, nor the thief steals, nor the robber kills any one. He who knows what he gave for them, is secure of every one of their number.* From which words we collect two things: first, That our Saviour offered the price of his own blood in some special way for the redemption of the predestinated; in such a way indeed, as that from thence follows their infallible salvation. Secondly, That he did not offer his blood in the same way for those who were passed by, or not predestinated; from whence they are denied *to have been purchased with the price of his blood in order to eternal life:* which is to be understood of an absolute and effectual ordination to eternal life to be completed and brought into act by the death of Christ.

TEST. 2. To this testimony another is allied (Serm. 50, de verbis Domini, p. 194, tom. 10,) *The predestinated were not yet gathered together; but he knew them who had predestinated them; he knew them who had come to redeem them with his own blood. He saw them, though they did not yet see him; he knew them, though they did not yet believe in him.* What is more plain, than that Christ came into the world, that he might redeem the predestinate with his own blood, and that he redeemed those who were effectually and infallibly to be brought to the participation of eternal life; in which way he never determined with himself to redeem the non-elect.

TEST. 3. The third testimony of the same Augustine, we shall produce from his book, (de natura & grat. cap. 5) which is as follows, *Those who are delivered, are not called vessels of their own merits, but vessels of mercy. Of whose mercy but his, who sent Christ Jesus into this world to save sinners? whom he foreknew, and predestinated, and called, and*

justified. As if he had said, That God, according to a special decree of mercy, sent Christ to deliver and save the predestinate effectually and infallibly; in which sense they alone are called *vessels of mercy.*

It would be useless to produce more passages from Augustine, whose opinion of the absolute predestination of some to eternal life and of the eternal giving of them to Christ the Mediator, that they might be by him infallibly led to the same, is known to all who are conversant with his writings. What is meant by predestination, and giving and leading to eternal life, without this special design of applying his death and merits to them, can neither be understood nor imagined. See cap. 18, de præd. Sanct. cap. 7, de bono persev. cap. 9, de cor. & grat.

TEST. 4. The fourth testimony may be derived from Ambrose, whose words are these (lib. 6, cap. 7, Luke;) *Although Christ suffered for all, yet he suffered specially for us, because he suffered for his church: therefore it is not to be doubted that much is due from him who hath received much.* Here we see that, according to the opinion of Ambrose, Christ in suffering had a special regard to his church, from whence it followed that she received the special benefit of that passion of Christ. Therefore he asserts, that Christ suffered for all; but so that the will and intention of Christ in suffering does not equally regard all men, but is directed in some singular manner towards his mystical body, that is, the church of the first-born, which he willed to acquire for himself with his own blood and to unite to himself by his Spirit, in order to the infallible participation of eternal life. He did not suffer for all men with this special intention.

TEST. 5. Remi, Bishop of Rheims, may follow Ambrose. He writes thus on Rom. viii., *Whom he predestinated or before appointed to reign with him in eternal blessedness, those he called and justified by his passion, by baptism, and faith, adorned with good works, and justified unto the end of life.* A little after, on these words, *He who spared not his own Son,* he says, *that is, did not preserve him from death, but delivered him up for us all who were predestinated to eternal*

life.—All these shew that Christ suffered for the elect and the elect alone, with a certain purpose of saving them; which is the special intention that we endeavour to establish, and which we contend is to be limited to the elect alone in this oblation of Christ.

TEST. 6. Fulgentius says (De incarn. & grat. Jesu. Chr. cap. 29, p. 92, Biblioth. Patr. tom. 6,) *Those who think that the will of God, by which he wills the salvation of all men, is equal towards the redeemed and the condemned; when they are asked, why God wills that all men should be saved, and yet all are not saved, what will they answer?* The learned Fulgentius intimates, that God of his special will hath determined that the salvation of those who are actually saved should be procured by Christ, and that those who affirm the contrary have nothing solid to answer when they are urged to shew from whence this distinction arises, that some are really saved by the death of Christ, and others are not saved. He demonstrates that this cannot be referred to the human will (cap. 30 and 31).

TEST. 7. I add another testimony of the same Fulgentius, (lib. 3, de verit. Prædest.) *Those whom God hath predestinated to the adoption of sons, no Christian ought to doubt that these were not only predestinated in Christ before the formation of the world, to the reward of glorification, but also to the grace of justification; and by virtue of this predestination were called according to purpose and justified.* He who does not doubt that the elect children of God were predestinated both to grace and glory before the formation of the world, will willingly confess, that the death and merit of Christ was ordained and accepted in some special way for these elect persons, that from thence they might infallibly obtain the grace and glory destined for them.

TEST. 8. Paschasius* (Biblioth. Patr. tom. 9, p. 930) on the words Matt. i. 21, *He shall save his people from their*

* PASCHASIUS RATBERTUS, a celebrated Benedictine of the 9th Century, was born at Soissons, and was carefully educated by the Monks of Notre Dame. He took the religious habit in the Abbey of Corbey, of which he became Abbot. About the year 831 he wrote a treatise "On the body and blood of Christ," in which he maintained, that after the consecration

sins, writes thus, Hence Zacharias says, HE HATH REDEEMED HIS PEOPLE IN THE HOUSE OF HIS SERVANT DAVID. *Therefore those whom he foreknew to be his own, without doubt he came to save; all the rest he hath left by his secret judgment in the mass of damnation.* In these words he teaches that Christ came into the world and suffered death, with some special intention of saving the predestinate; but he had not the same special intention to effect the salvation of others, although he was willing to make salvation procurable by all on condition of faith.

TEST. 9. Gregory the Great says (Moral, lib. 22, cap. 18, p. 132,) *For the only begotten Son of God to intercede for man, is, with the co-eternal Father, the same as to demonstrate that he was man; and for him to have petitioned in behalf of human nature, is to have taken the same nature into the height of his divinity. He intercedes, therefore, for us, not with words, but with compassion; because what he was unwilling should be condemned in the elect, he delivered them from by undertaking it.* The last words are especially to be noticed, in which it is clearly indicated, that Christ in his whole mediatorial office had a special regard to the infallible deliverance of the elect.

TEST. 10. Bernard on Psalm xci., *He who dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High*, vers. 9th, says, *Christ died for his friends, that is, to acquire them; so that out of ene-*

of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the identical body and blood of Christ were really present. Thus was revived and brought into shape in the Latin Church that doctrine which has occasioned so much contention in the Church and havoc among Christians—the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which had been first started by a Monk at the beginning of the 7th Century. This doctrine being thus introduced into the Western Church occasioned a violent controversy. It was vigorously opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, the most considerable man of his times, who says, it was an error newly broached. Most of the learned men of that age took part in the controversy it excited. Paschasius was constrained to resign his Abbey in consequence of the opposition his opinion met, and he died soon after, in 865. His other works are Commentaries on St. Matthew; on Psalm xliv.; and on the Lamentations of Jeremiah: with Treatises De Partu Virginis; De Corpore Christi, &c. His works were collected and published by Father Sirmond, in 1618.

mies he might make them friends. A little after, *Thus, therefore, Christ died as to time for the ungodly, but as to predestination for his brethren and friends;* which is the same as if he had said, That Christ in dying on the cross had a singular respect to the predestinate, his future brethren and friends.

But passing from the antients, let us descend to the Schoolmen and modern Popish writers, who, while they contend that Christ died for all, at the same time acknowledge that he died for the elect alone, with special intention of applying his death to them, in order to the infallible attainment of eternal life.

Test. 1. Let us begin with the Master of the Schoolmen, Peter Lombard: *Christ offered himself on the cross for all men, as to the sufficiency of the price, but for the elect only as to its efficacy; because he brings salvation to the predestinate alone* (lib. 3, dist. 20, lit. E.) The argument which he adjoins, why Christ is said to have died for the elect alone as to its efficacy, is most worthy of notice. For he does not say with the Pelagians and Arminians, that they alone were foreseen to be excited by grace to apply Christ to themselves, according to the freedom of their own will; but that he effected salvation in them alone through the benignity of his special mercy. Now what he has effected in the elect, without doubt he determined to effect in them. And this is that special intention according to which we profess that the death of Christ referred and was ordained for the elect alone.

Test. 2. Aquinas says, (part. 3, qu. 24, art. 4,) *God fore-ordained our salvation, by predestinating from eternity that it should be completed through Jesus Christ.* Aquinas speaks of the elect, and asserts that God ordained, from eternity, that their salvation should be infallibly completed through Jesus Christ. I ask, then, how Christ exhibited himself as conformed to the eternal appointment of his Father, if, in his saving passion, he had not applied his merits in a peculiar manner infallibly to effect and complete the salvation of the elect? It is granted, then, that the special intention of God in accepting this sacrifice,

and of Christ in offering himself, was limited to the elect alone, as far as the passion of Christ is joined with the infallible effect of salvation as to individuals.

TEST. 3. Aquinas also observes (Quæst. disp. de grat. Christi. art. 7, resp. ad 4,) *The merit of Christ as to its sufficiency equally regards all men, but not as to its efficacy; which arises partly from free-will, partly from the election of God, through which the effect of the merits of Christ is mercifully conferred upon some, but is by his just judgment withdrawn from others.* What Aquinas says, that it arises partly from free-will, that the merits of Christ as to their efficacy do not equally regard all men, is to be understood with respect to those who are lost, who, of their own free-will turn themselves away from the fountain of salvation: but what he says, that this inequality arises partly from the election of God, is to be understood with respect to those who are saved, who, because God, according to the good pleasure of his election, has special compassion on them, receive from the fountain of salvation whatever is necessary to effect their salvation. That this was the sentiment of Aquinas appears from his answer to the last argument, where he says, *That this is conferred freely upon men by God, that they obtain the efficacy of the merit of Christ.* If the effect of the merits of Christ is mercifully conferred on some certain persons by the election of God, and is at the same time denied to others, who can doubt that Christ, being most conscious of the election of God and of his calling, offered himself and his merits specially for these persons, and to the price of his death, which was most sufficient in itself, added moreover the most effectual and special intention of his will, in order to effect the salvation of these elect persons? To this those words refer (John x. 15,) *I lay down my life for the sheep,* namely, with some special intention of effectually redeeming and delivering them, and leading them to life eternal; as may be collected from the whole discourse of our Saviour at that time.

TEST. 4. Scotus (in 3 Sentent. dist. 19, quæst. 1) has

many things which greatly conduce to the illustration of our opinion; this especially: *As the Word foresaw that his passion would be offered to the Father for the elect, so he offered it effectually in the event, and the whole Trinity effectually accepted his passion for them; and for no others was it effectually offered, nor from eternity accepted.* Scotus acknowledges, that, according to the eternal decree of the whole Trinity, the passion of Christ was offered and accepted in some singular way, and with some special intention for the elect.

TEST. 5. Hugo de St. Victor (de Sacr. fid. lib. 1, part. 8, cap. 7, where he has a treatise on the passion of Christ) writes thus: *Human nature was corrupted by sin, and altogether under the sentence of condemnation through sin; and therefore if all had been condemned, there would have been no injustice. But grace came, and chose some out of the mass of mankind through mercy to salvation, and left others through justice in condemnation.* Hugo plainly teaches that Christ in coming into the world and offering himself for the sins of the human race, had a special regard to the elect, whom he chose from the mass of mankind; and whom, according to the eternal good pleasure of God, he determined to bring to salvation through the merits of his death, and does always actually bring them to it.

TEST. 6. Cajetan, in explaining Rom. viii. 32, *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* writes thus, *Paul had perceived that the aforesaid argument of so many gifts did not effectually infer that God worked* ALL THINGS *to the elect for good; but that God worked for good to them; and therefore that he might effectually conclude that it was with respect to* ALL THINGS, *he added, that God had freely given even his Son for the elect, that thence he might infer that all things were given with the Son to the elect.* These words of Cajetan cannot be accommodated to that universal giving of Christ, by which it is understood that he was equally given for the whole world: for this being granted, God would equally give all things

to all men; which is evidently false. Therefore some special giving must necessarily be admitted, according to which Christ may be understood to be given for the elect alone, and which alone brings with it an infallible and certain giving of all things necessary to salvation.

TEST. 7. Stapleton, (Promptuar. moral. Dominic. 2, post. Pasch. p. 254) observes, *Christ in dying died effectually indeed for his friends alone, and for those who would become his friends after the conversion of each of them, not for those who were his friends before.* This Papist does not fear to acknowledge a special intention of Christ in dying as to the elect. For these were to be his friends after their conversion, for the effectual redemption of whom Christ laid down his life, when, together with others, they were ungodly enemies, sinners, dead in sins. He is said indeed to have died for all men, as to the sufficiency of his death; but for his sheep or his elect, as to its efficacy; that is, with the special intention of giving to them, through the merit of his death, that effectual grace by which they should believe and be saved.

TEST. 8. Estius, on the words (Titus ii. 14) *Who gave himself for us,* says, *that is, who having assumed our flesh delivered up himself, whether for all men, or especially for the elect, in whose person Paul often speaks. For the price of the death of Christ is sufficient indeed for the redemption of all men, but it is applied for salvation to the elect alone.* Estius here intimates two things; *first,* That the oblation of Christ had a general regard to all men, but a special one to the elect; *secondly,* That the special regard ought to consist in this, that it should be joined with a certain intention of applying it. For he does not say, The elect alone apply this death of Christ to themselves for salvation through the strength of their free-will; but, It is applied to these alone for salvation; truly, by the special favour of God in choosing them and intending this great benefit for his elect through the death of Christ.

TEST. 9. I come now to the Jesuits, who although they defend universal grace and universal redemption, yet dare not deny the special and effectual appointment and inten-

tion of this saving passion as to the elect. Let two of the most eminent, Suares and Vasques,* speak for the rest. Suares (in 3 Aquin. qu. 19, disp. p. 635, 41) remarks, *As Christ prayed for men in a different manner; so he merited in a different manner, for some sufficiently, for others effectually. On which account, although he is the universal Redeemer of all, and a sufficient cause of salvation, yet he is in a special way the effectual cause of salvation to those whom he makes obedient to himself. For it cannot be supposed, that Christ did not otherwise offer his merits for those whom he knew to be elected by the Father, than for others, when he saw that it was the will of the Father that these should be infallibly saved, and not the others.* Suares here allows, that the death and merits of Christ are effectual to the salvation of the elect on account of the special mode of the oblation, and the will of the Offerer; not on account of the causal or contingent act of the human will in apprehending it.

. Test. 10. Vasques (in 1 Aquin. qu. 23, disp. 49, cap. 3, p. 687) clearly acknowledges this special intention of Christ as to the elect in the application of his merits. *I doubt not that Christ by his peculiar prayer and will applied his merits to those who were predestinated and elected.* Again, (in 3 Aquin. qu. 19, disp. 77, cap. 5, p. 384) he produces Andreas Vegas† asserting, *That the merits of Christ did not profit all men effectually, because Christ did not pray, nor offer his passion for those whom they do not profit.* We have

* Suares, vide Note p. 529.—Vasques, or Gabriel Vazquez, a Jesuit, author of various works collected in 10 vols. folio. Lugduni, 1620, containing Commentaries upon Thomas Aquinas, and similar works. He died at Alcala, in 1604, aged 55.—*(Antonii Biblioth. Hispania.)*

† Andreas Vegas, or Andreas de Vega, a Spanish Franciscan, a Professor at Salamanca. He was at the Council of Trent in 1546, and was looked upon there to be a very able Divine, and had a great share in the *Decrees of that Council concerning Justification.* He wrote a defence of them in fifteen Books, in which he treats at large of Justification; after which come fifteen questions upon the same subject, which are, as it were, an abridgment of that work, in which he treats of Faith, Grace, Good Works, and Merits, printed at *Venice* in 1548, and at *Cologne* in 1572; and, with a Preface by *Canisius*, at *Aschaffembourg* in 1621. This work of Vega's is a Commentary upon the Decrees of the 6th Session of the Council of Trent upon Justification.—[For a clear understanding of the different opinions on

then, not only the antient Fathers, but even the modern Papists, confessing what we are endeavouring to demonstrate, namely, That the death of Christ was so constituted by God to be an universal cause of salvation applicable to all men, that at the same time, through some special intention of him who offered and him who accepted it, it is constituted a particular cause of salvation to be infallibly and especially applied to all the elect, and to them alone. See also Malderi Anti Synod, p. 138.

Test. 11. Lastly, our own Divines, who do not deny that Christ suffered for all, yet at the same time profess that he redeemed the elect by his death in some peculiar manner. Bucer expresses his opinion on these words, (Matt. i. 21) *He shall save his people, that is, the elect, whom the Father brings to him. By his death he expiated the sins of all the elect, and merited that the Father being propitious to them should give them his Spirit.* Here observe that Christ by his death merited something for the elect, which he did not merit for others: But what Christ merited for any one, he merited according to the appointment and acceptance of his Father: Therefore, according to the will and appointment of the Father, the death of Christ pertains to the elect in some special way, in which it is not extended to others. Musculus, who in his Common-places strongly urges, that Christ is to be esteemed an universal Redeemer, yet acknowledges a special intention of Christ concerning the redemption of the elect, (on Rom. 8) where he says, *That Christ came into this world for the sake of the elect.* Which cannot be otherwise understood than that he came into the world with a peculiar intention of infallibly saving the elect. Which special intention of obtaining for the elect the benefit of his passion to be applied to them, is so far peculiar to them, that it is not extended to others.

this important subject, and the point upon which all difficulty turns, the Editor would recommend to every doubting mind the perusal of Scott's Continuation of Milner, Vol. II. chap. xiii.]—Vega wrote also a *Commentary upon some other passages in the Council of Trent*, printed at Alcala, in 1574. *A Commentary* likewise *upon the Psalms*, bearing his name, was printed at the same place in 1599.—*(Du Pin.)*

Calvin, on Heb. ii. 13, at the words, *Behold, I and the children which God hath given me,* says, *Christ brings none to the Father, but those whom He hath given him. But we know that this giving depends on eternal election; because those whom the Father hath destined to life, he delivers into the custody of the Son, that he may preserve them in safety.* Three things are here to be observed; *first,* That God the Father hath specially destined some to life by the decree of election: *secondly,* That Christ the Mediator hath received these elect persons as peculiarly commended to him by the Father: *thirdly,* That Christ takes special care of these elect persons, and so defends and governs them in this life, that at length he may lead them to life eternal. Which things being granted, he would be destitute both of reason and religion who should deny that Christ, in the work of his oblation and of human redemption, intended the salvation of these persons with a peculiar, that is, with an absolute and effectual will. Zanchius (in Miscell. tract. de præd. Sanct. p. 14) observes, *It is not false that Christ died for all men: for the passion of Christ is offered to all in the Gospel. But he died effectually for the elect alone, because indeed they only are made partakers of the efficacy of the passion of Christ.* But that they only are made partakers effectually of this passion, is to be referred to the special and effectual will of Christ in suffering, and of God the Father in accepting this sacrifice in a peculiar way for the elect more than for others: for in the participation of saving good, the will of God precedes the human will. Lastly, that I may not be tedious in bringing together many authors, Vorstius* him-

* Vorstius (Conrad), an eminent Divine of the Arminian sect, born at Cologne in 1569, was the son of a dyer with a numerous family, who secretly seceded to the Protestant Communion. Conrad, who was destined to a literary life, after passing five years at a village grammar-school, was entered, in 1587, at the College of St. Lawrence, at Cologne, which he quitted without taking a degree, but was subsequently sent to Haerlem and Heidelburgh, at which University he was created a Doctor of Divinity. After visiting the Academies of Switzerland, and giving lectures on theology at Geneva, in 1596, he accepted the Professorship of the latter faculty at Steinfurt, where he also officiated as Minister until 1610, when he received a call to succeed Arminius in the professorship of Theology at Ley-

self could not deny that the redemption completed on the cross pertains in some peculiar way to the elect. For thus he speaks (in Amica duplic. p. 230) *It appears that the word redemption may be applied in a different sense to many species of the same genus; and therefore it may be properly said, that some only, and not all, were redeemed in some special way or peculiar sense, and so it is usually said in the holy Scriptures.* Again (page 235,) answering a passage produced from Heb. xiii. 20, in which Christ is called *The great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,* he grants, *that Christ is the Shepherd of these sheep, and indeed of these only, in a peculiar way, namely, as to the saving and spiritual act of feeding them, which contains the actual gift of the Holy Spirit; and also as to some special ac-*

den. Having accepted this offer, he soon became involved in the controversial war which raged in the Netherlands; and the Gomarists, or rigid Calvinists, taking advantage of a book which he had lately published, entitled, *Tractatus Theologicus de Deo, sive de Natura et Attributiis Dei,* they accused him of heresy, and engaged several foreign Universities in the party. In particular, they obtained the aid of our own James I., who, on receiving the book of Vorstius, in an hour's time drew up a large Catalogue of heresies from it, which he sent to his minister at the Hague, with an order to certify to the States how much he detested those alleged errors. He also caused his book to be burnt in London; and informed the States, who had sent a doubtful reply that they would inquire into the case, that if they did not dismiss Vorstius, none of his subjects should visit Leyden. James moreover wrote against Vorstius, who respectfully replied; all which would not have prevailed upon the States to dismiss him, but for the untimely appearance of a book by some of his disciples, entitled, *De Officio Christiani Hominis,* which contained some Anti-trinitarian doctrines; and although formally disclaimed by Vorstius, so much odium was thereby excited against him, that he provisionally resigned the professorship, from which, by the Synod of Dort, he was entirely dismissed, and banished by the States of Holland from their territories. He lived for more than two years in secrecy, frequently changing his abode in fear for his life, until in 1623 the Duke of Holstein collected the dispersed followers of Arminianism, and assigned them a spot of ground for building a city. To this place Vorstius retired, but died soon after at Toningen, in Sept. 1622, at the age of 53. According to Bayle and Sandius, the opinions of this theologian probably leaned towards Socinianism, or at least he dogmatized on the attributes of God in a manner which was quite unusual at the period.—The Reader who desires to see a more ample account of him and his opinions, may consult Nichols's Life of Arminius with advantage, Appendix P. pp. 202—236.

quisition of these sheep. I ask, what this is which Vorstius concedes to us, when he grants, *that not all, but some, were redeemed by the death of Christ in a special way and peculiar sense?* and when he says, *that Christ is the Shepherd of his sheep in a peculiar manner, as to some special acquisition of them?* If he means nothing more than that in the event the benefit of redemption pertains to some, that is, to those that believe, in a special and peculiar way, according to the different acts of the human will, he merely trifles, and does not at all answer the testimonies brought against him. For all those passages, *He purchased the church with his own blood: he is the Saviour of the body; he laid down his life for the sheep: he died that he might gather together in one the children of God:* these, and such like texts, do not point out any special works of the Church, the body, or the sheep; but the special intention and operation of the Husband, the Head, the Shepherd, respecting this Church, this body, these sheep, by his special will determining and procuring their salvation by the virtue and merit of his death.

Against all these things which we have discussed respecting the special intention of Christ in dying being referred and restricted to the elect, and concerning the saving application of the death of Christ depending upon and flowing from that intention, it may be urged by way of

Objection, 1. If it is granted that in the oblation of Christ there was such an intention limited to the elect, so as that an effectual application and infallible salvation is obtained for them, then we seem to refer their justification and salvation not so much to the good pleasure and special mercy of God, as to some kind of justice. For if it should be inquired, why Peter rather than Judas received effectual grace and salvation from the merit of the death of Christ? it will be answered, according to our opinion, Because Christ, by his special intention, and by the application of his merits, merited that for Peter which he did not merit for Judas. But that which is given, from the merits of Christ being peculiarly applied to any person, does not seem to be given merely from the mercy of the

good pleasure of God, but rather from justice : because it is just that what Christ hath merited for these or those persons, should be specially assigned to them. But this seems to contradict the Apostle, who derives grace, and the infallible salvation of the predestinate, from the mere favour of God.

Reply. There is no opposition between these two opinions, *God justifies and saves Peter of pure grace, or of his own mere good pleasure,* and, *God justifies and saves Peter in consideration of the merits of Christ being specially ordained and accepted for the salvation of Peter.* The reason of this is plain, Because God, who, of his own mere good pleasure and pure mercy, determined to give faith and salvation to Peter, determined at the same time not to give to him these things otherwise than through and on account of the merits of Christ, destined for and given to Peter in some singular way, and that from the same good pleasure and pure mercy. This good pleasure of God is opposed to our merits, and is accomplished, not made void by the merits of Christ being applied to us. From whence the Apostle (Heb. xiii. 21) says, that God *works in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.* Therefore, although it is of the mere good pleasure of God, that he is willing to grant to Peter effectual grace and salvation, yet this good pleasure is not accomplished otherwise than through the merits of Christ. This, then, is the sum of our reply ; Although every work of special grace which is done in the elect is done on account of the merits of Christ being specially applied to them, yet in their justification and salvation is seen the true way of mercy, and not of justice ; because Christ with his merits, with this very mode of meriting and offering his merits, some special regard being had to the elect, the whole of this, I say, derives its origin from the gratuitous good will of God towards them.

Objection 2. If we admit that the elect obtain effectual grace or saving faith because the death and merit of Christ in suffering on the cross was applied to them by some special intention, then we seem to admit that the

merits of the passion of Christ were imputed or applied to some men before they believed. But this is contrary to the received opinion of Divines, which asserts that faith is an instrument or medium, without which the merits of the passion of Christ are not applied to individuals. It is necessary, therefore, that this act of faith should exist, which may have the merits of Christ specially applied or imputed to it. How, then, can this special application of the merits of Christ to the elect, who are not yet made faithful and believing, be applied?

Reply. In order to meet this objection, let us make the words of the Apostle (Eph. i. 3) the foundation of our remarks, *God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ*, that is, whatever saving good comes to us from God, is given to us through Christ and for the sake of his merits. Therefore, since saving faith itself, which is peculiar to the elect, is to be placed among the chief spiritual blessings, it ought to be granted, that it is given on account of the merits of Christ, to all those to whom it is actually given. Therefore, what Divines commonly say, that faith is the instrument, by means of which the merits of Christ are applied to us, is to be understood of its application, as it is considered on the part of men: For the elect cannot apply to themselves the merits of Christ in order to the reception of any spiritual benefits whatever, unless through faith being first supposed to be in them. But if we consider the application or imputation on the part of God alone, then we say, That God both can and does apply, that is, impute and communicate to men the merits of Christ, so that, from regard to those merits, he gives to them spiritual good things, even when they are reckoned impious and unbelieving. For faith, when it is first given, is not given to a believer, but to an unbeliever; but it is given to the elect on account of the merits of the Mediator. Therefore we must necessarily confess, that none of the elect can, by believing, apply to themselves the merits of Christ in order to the fruition of eternal life, unless God of his special mercy should, on account of the merits of Christ, first give them faith whereby they may

believe. And this is that special application of the merits of Christ, which we affirm pertains to the elect by some peculiar privilege, from the special will of Christ in offering himself, and of God the Father in accepting this sacrifice. Scotus had respect to this in his saying, which is most worthy of observation, *That this was the principal thing in the merit of Christ*, that he merited that those should be united to him who had not been so before (lib. 3, dist. 19, qu. 1, p. 75). Which is the same as if he had said, that the chief efficacy of the merits of Christ consisted in this, that he merited, that some of those who believed not should actually become believers, and, being united to Christ by faith, should obtain eternal life. This is that special ordination and application of the merits of Christ, which altogether depends on the good pleasure of God, and not on the free-will of men.

Objection 3. If in Christ's offering himself, and God's accepting that sacrifice, there was some special intention of quickening and infallibly saving all the elect, by the virtue and merit of this sacrifice, we seem to exclude from this special privilege the elect under the Old Testament, who were born and died before this sacrifice of Christ was made on the cross.

Reply. As to the argument of general sufficiency or special efficacy, I answer, That the sacrifice of Christ had the same virtue under the Old Testament, before the external act of its exhibition, as it had and has under the New Testament, after Christ was really exhibited and offered on the cross. For as, from the special intention of God, special grace is derived to the elect under the New Testament, on account of the merit of this sacrifice now actually offered ; so, from the special will of the same God, special grace flowed to the elect under the Old Testament on account of the merit of the sacrifice afterwards to be offered. For Christ was *a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world* both in the preparation of his own will, and in the acceptance of the will of the Father. It is, therefore, here to be observed, that there is one kind of cause which operates physically, or naturally, another which operates me-

ritoriously, or morally. A cause which acts physically, must necessarily be brought into action, before any effect can be produced by virtue of it: but a cause which acts meritoriously, or morally, such as is the passion of Christ, may produce its effect before it actually exists, unless it precedes, at least in his knowledge and acceptance to whom it refers, by regard to him, to dispense the benefits of his grace to men. For in this thing a meritorious cause has some connexion with a final cause, which, though not yet actually existing, but being only foreseen and previously considered, very much moves the agent in doing this or that. In this manner we say that the passion of Christ, and his merits depending upon it, having been foreseen as offered to God, and to be specially applied to Jacob, and not to Esau, were a kind of moving cause to God to give to Jacob that special grace which he denied to Esau. Suares rightly says, (in 3, qu. 49, art. 4, in Comm.) *That special love by which, on account of the merits of Christ either given or foreseen, God sanctifies and reconciles men to himself, may be included in the merits of Christ, either by his meriting for us the effect of that love, or the love (or election) of God freely bestowed upon us.*

Objection 4. Lastly, it may be objected, That it is not consistent, or rather it is altogether incongruous, that God, who willed that the death of Christ, with the rich treasure of his merits included in it, should be equally applicable to all men for the obtaining of eternal life, on condition of faith, was, at the same time, unwilling to prepare and give this faith, on account of the same merits of Christ, equally to all; but should give persevering and saving faith to the elect alone, and that on account of the merits of Christ being limited to and ordained for them by some special will and regard of God.

Reply. I answer, where any Divine act appears, it is rash, I will not say impious, to doubt of its equity or congruity. But we have already demonstrated, that now, by the death of Christ, a covenant was established with the human race, according to the tenor of which, eternal life is promised to every man on condition of faith. Of this

covenant Rupert observes, (in 4, Gen. cap. 34) *We say that that covenant, by which alone the enmities were removed which had subsisted between God and men, was many times indeed promised, but once executed, namely, by the passion of Christ the Son of God. For in this, without any contradiction, is a certain foundation of peace, while God, accepting the faith of men, gives to them Christ his Son, that they may be saved by him.* Therefore no doubt is to be entertained of this appointment of God, founded on the death and merits of Christ, and having respect to all men individually. But it is still questionable, whether, granting this universal covenant of giving eternal life to all men, if they should believe, God exercises his liberty, and exhibits his special mercy, in giving to the elect that saving faith by which they may believe, and that through Christ, and on account of his merits, applied to them by some peculiar privilege. The thing speaks for itself. For we see that the elect, and the elect alone, eventually obtain from God persevering and saving faith. But suppose that so great a gift were specially given to them in any other way or respect, than on account of the merits of Christ, ordained and applied to them by some special intention of God; it is altogether unlawful to suppose it. For as Ambrose excellently says on Eph. i. 2, *(He hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ), Every gift of grace is through Christ.* These things being settled, although (as I said) it is useless to dispute of the congruity of Divine actions where there is evidence of the facts themselves, yet, that no scruple may be left, we say, *first*, That this special intention of God, according to which he determined with himself, on account of the merits of Christ, to give to the elect the special benefits of effectual grace and salvation, does not clash with that conditional compact, *Whosoever believeth shall be saved*, but is rather a kind of special design subordinate to the infallible fulfilment of this universal compact. For those who trust to their own free-will, with some little helps of grace, repel or oppose faith. Lest, therefore, this universal compact should not bring the effect of salvation to any one, God, by a special and

secret intention, hath taken care that the merit of the death of Christ should be applied to some for the infallible obtaining of faith and eternal life. *Secondly*, we say, That it is not unjust or incongruous, that this special intention of an effectual application of the merits of Christ should exhibit its efficacy in some, and not in all men; because, since the death of Christ is a free gift of God bestowed on the human race, the free distribution and application of merits arising from it, ought by all means to depend on the mere will of God. *Thirdly*, we add, That God, who in the Gospel has promised eternal life to all men individually, on account of the merits of Christ, if they believe, yet has not promised to any unbeliever, that he would give to him, on account of the merits of Christ, infallibly and perseveringly to believe. I ask, then, Where is this inconsistency to be found? Not with respect to those who believe and are saved; for it is not culpable injustice to give, on account of the merits of Christ, to individual persons what was not promised to them individually, but it is laudable goodness to do this. Not with respect to those who believe not, and perish; for it is not unjust in itself, nor can it be judged to be inconsistent with the supreme goodness of God, to deny that benefit to any one, which it appears is not in any way due to him.

Therefore, let this be the sum and conclusion of this whole controversy on the death of Christ; That Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, in confirming the evangelical covenant, according to the tenor of which eternal life is due to every one that believeth, made no division or separation of men, so that we can say that any one is excluded from the benefit of his death, if he should believe. And in this sense we contend, in agreement with the Scriptures, the fathers, and solid arguments, that Christ suffered on the cross and died for all men, or for the whole human race. We add, moreover, that this Mediator, when he had determined to lay down his life for sin, had also this special intention, that, by virtue of his merits, he would effectually and infallibly quicken and bring to eternal life, some persons who were specially

given to him by the Father. And in this sense we contend that Christ laid down his life for the elect alone, or in order to purchase his Church; that is, that he died for them alone, with the special and certain purpose of effectually regenerating and saving them by the merit of his death. Therefore, although the merit of Christ equally regards all men as to its sufficiency, yet it does not as to its efficacy: which is to be understood, not only on account of the effect produced in one and not in another, but also on account of the will, with which Christ himself merited, and offered his merits, in a different way for different persons. Now, the first cause and source of this diversity, was the election and will of God, to which the human will of Christ conformed itself. And from hence Suares rightly deduces, *That this merit of Christ is the very cause of spiritual regeneration, and gives it efficacy, and produces its effect, and at the same time is the cause why that man is regenerated, on account of whom he specially offered his merit* (in 3, qu. 19, disp. 41, § 2, p. 635.) For our Divines, let that eminently learned man of pious memory, Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, speak. Thus he says, (in Thomson Diatr. p. 94) *Although we do not deny that Christ died for all men, yet we believe that he died specially and peculiarly for the Church, nor does the benefit of redemption pertain in an equal degree to all. And from the peculiarity of this benefit, and from the human will, in some degree depends the efficacy of all means, that they* are for those only, and for their use, *whom Christ redeemed with some peculiar regard to their being elected in him. Nor do they obtain the effect, because of being willing, but because God, according to the purpose of his own grace, works in the elect and redeemed to will that to which he chooses them.* Therefore, He, who by his death merited eternal life sufficiently for all men, so as that it is to be given to all, according to the evangelical covenant, if they believe, also merited most effectually for some, by the peculiar application of his merits, that they should believe, and that they should receive eternal life from the gratuitous gift of God, through and on account

of our Lord Jesus Christ. And this is the peculiar lot of the elect: Of which may the Father of Mercies make us all partakers! To whom, with the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be honour, praise, and glory now and for ever. Amen.

END OF THE DISSERTATION.

ON THE CONTROVERSY,

&c. &c.

ON THE CONTROVERSY

AMONG THE

FRENCH DIVINES OF THE REFORMED CHURCH,

CONCERNING

[a]THE GRACIOUS AND SAVING WILL OF GOD TOWARDS SINFUL MEN.*

THERE are some [b]who so contend for the particular election in Christ, through the mere good pleasure of God, of some certain persons, and their effectual and irrevocable calling to grace and glory, that at the same time they assert, that, Christ having died for all men individually, [c]*with some general intention,* [d]God, *by his universal grace,* founded on his death, which was sufficient in itself, and by a *suitable* invitation and calling *to repentance,* although in different ways, *gives to all individually that they may be saved if they will;* [e]so that it arises from themselves alone, and the hardness of their heart repelling the means of salvation, if they are not saved. Which was the opinion of D. Cameron,†

* Vide Life of Bishop Davenant, p. xxxix.

† JOHN CAMERON was an eminent divine among the French Protestants, born at Glasgow about the year 1580. After completing his literary education at his native place, he was in 1600 induced to visit Bourdeux, and

B. M. and as it appears to them of the [f] Deputies from England and the Republic of Bremen at the Synod of Dort.

There are, [g] on the other hand, those who *deny that Christ died for all men individually, with the intention of saving them, and that God really wills that all men individually should be saved.* They wish that the opinion of the Deputies from England and Bremen on this subject should be rejected by the Synod of Dort, or referred to an opposite Synod : and think the opinion of Cameron and his disciples as pure Arminianism, a hydra of errors, opposed to the Synod of Dort, a subversion of the nature of the Divine law, of the Gospel, of the necessity

by the minister of that city was appointed to teach the learned languages at Bergeron. He was subsequently appointed Professor of Philosophy at Sedan, and after remaining in that capacity two years, returned to Bourdeux, and engaged in the study of Divinity. In 1608 he assumed the office of Minister in that town, and then accepted of the Divinity Chair at Saumur, where he continued until the dispersion of that academy in 1621. He then removed to England, and was made by King James Master of the Colleges and Divinity Professor at Glasgow ; but found the appointment so disagreeable, that he returned to France, where the disputes between the two religions were now bringing on a civil war. Cameron, whose principles disinclined him to violence, having opposed the emissaries of the Duke de Rohan, who endeavoured to induce the people of Montauban to take arms, was attacked by a zealot of the party in the streets, and severely beaten ; and such was the effect upon his mind and body, that he died soon after, aged 46. According to Bayle, he was a man of great parts and learning, but insufferably long-winded and vain. He was the author of an attempt to reconcile the doctrine of predestination with a more consoling notion of the Divine justice and benevolence, a theory which was more fully developed in the " System of Universal Grace," by his disciple Amyraut, but which Mosheim says, after examination, he was persuaded was no more than Arminianism or Pelagianism artfully dressed up, and ingeniously covered with a half-transparent veil of specious, but ambiguous expressions. Cameron's Theological Lectures are printed in three Vols. 4to. Saumur, and in one Vol. folio, Geneva.

of the Christian Religion, to be expelled from the Reformed Churches.

THE OPINION *of the Divines of* ENGLAND, *the most celebrated in the whole Christian world, is requested on this controversy, as it appears that this might conduce not a little towards confirming the peace of the Reformed Church in* FRANCE.

THE

JUDGMENT OF BISHOP DAVENANT.

[a]THE gracious and saving will of God towards sinners is to be considered, as effectually applying to some persons, of his special mercy, the means of saving grace, according to that saying of the Apostle, *He hath mercy on whom he will;* or, as appointing sufficiently for all, of his common philanthropy, the means of saving grace, applicable to all for salvation, according to the tenor of the covenant of grace, as the Evangelist has said, *God so loved the world,* &c. Those whom the Divine will or good pleasure embraces under the first description, on them it always confers the means of saving grace in this life, and the end of grace, that is, life eternal, or glory, in the world to come (Rom. viii. 28, 29, &c.; Eph. i. 3—5, &c. Those whom the Divine will embraces only under the latter description, on them it sometimes confers the means of saving grace, and sometimes does not; but it never confers the end of grace, that is, eternal life.

[b]In this opinion, which is said to have been that of D. Cameron, the first member of the sentence is legitimately constructed, if he understands, that particular election,

mere good pleasure, and effectual calling to grace and glory, depend in such a manner on the Divine will, that it does not separate this Divine will from the foreseen acts of the human will. For he who does this, falls into the error of the Semipelagians.

[c]The second member of the sentence is involved and perplexed with so many ambiguous forms of speaking, that it is difficult to determine its truth or falsehood, without first dividing it into portions.

PART I.

Christ died for all men individually, with some general intention.

Christ is rightly said to have died for all men, inasmuch as on his death is founded a covenant of salvation, applicable to all men while they are in this world. Nor can he be improperly said to have died for each individually, inasmuch as his death may profit each for salvation, according to the tenor of the new covenant, none being excluded. On the other hand, it cannot profit any individual, contrary to the tenor of that covenant, although he should be of the elect. If Cain or Judas had believed and repented, he would be saved through the benefit and merit of the death of Christ. If David or Peter had not believed, nor repented, he would not be saved. In this sense the death of Christ may be understood to be set equally before all men individually.

What is added in the last place, concerning the general intention of God, by which he wills that all men individually should be saved through the death of his Son, needs explanation. It must be observed, therefore, that according to the custom of the Scriptures, the Divine will or intention sometimes denotes merely the appointment of means to an end, although there is no determinate will in God of producing that end by those means. And the Schoolmen refer this intention or will of God to the com-

mon order of Providence. In this sense he willed and intended the obedience and salvation of the angels who apostatised, inasmuch as he furnished them with gifts, fit in themselves and suitable, to perform obedience and obtain salvation. And in this sense God, with a general intention, wills life to all men, inasmuch as he willed the death of Christ to be the fountain and cause of life to all men individually, according to the tenor of the evangelical covenant. But we must observe, that the Scriptures mention another will or intention of God, and that properly so called, which never fails in producing the good intended, and which the Schoolmen refer to the order of special predestination. Of this intention or will of God, Augustine rightly says from the Psalmist, (Ench. cap. 97) *In heaven and in earth there are some things which God did not both will and perform; there are some things which he willed and did not perform, though he hath done all things whatsoever he would.* And Aquinas, (1. qu. 10, art. 6.) *Whatever God simply wills, he performs.* If, therefore, by this general intention of God to procure the salvation of all men by the death of Christ, they wish to exclude the special will, and special and effectual operation of God in effecting the salvation of the elect; or if they would infer from thence, That the benefit of the death of Christ, that is, the grace of God and eternal salvation of men (as far as relates to God) is intended for all men individually with the same kind of will, and is applied by the same mode of operation, really and actually to be had and obtained by each individual, according as he makes a good use of his own free-will; they bring forward Semipelagianism. But if by this general intention they mean nothing more than a general aptitude and sufficiency in the death of Christ to effect the salvation of all men individually in the mode of an universal cause, or a general appointment of God concerning the salvation of all men individually, who, through the grace of God, duly apply to themselves this universal cause; then there is no need to reject this form of speaking.

PART II.

[d]*That God, by his universal grace founded in the death of Christ, which was sufficient in itself, and by a suitable invitation and calling to repentance, although in different ways, grants to all men individually, that they may be saved if they will.*

The term universal grace does not sound well with the Orthodox; for those gifts which are bestowed upon all men individually (although they are given to the unworthy and the undeserving) are not referred to that which is called the grace of Christ, but to the common philanthropy of God. From whence the opinion, *That the grace of God is universal, or is given to all individually*, seemed to be erroneous to Augustine, Prosper, Fulgentius, and the other adversaries of the Pelagians. If, therefore, this Author means by universal grace, That the grace of Christ is given and actually communicated to every individual of the human race, I do not see by what means this form of speech can be defended. For the saving grace of Christ (if we believe the Apostles) is communicated to individuals by the preaching of the Gospel. (Mark xvi. 15, 16; Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 21.) From whence Prosper says, *They live without grace, and are not partakers of Christian grace, to whom Christ was never preached.* The Apostle affirms the same thing of the Ephesians, before Christ was preached to them. (Eph. ii. 12.) But if by universal grace, he means nothing more than an universal capacity of salvation in all persons living in this world, or an universal propensity in God to save every man, if he should believe in Christ, he ought to correct his language, lest by unusual, and a less sound form of words, he should give offence to the Orthodox. Further, this universal grace of some kind being admitted, that which he adds, *That God, through this universal grace, by an invitation suitable and sufficient in itself, calls all men to repentance,* is refuted by the experience of time, and the

contrary event of things. For if he speaks of repentance, which remission of sins and eternal life follows, that invitation or calling is not apt or sufficient in itself for such repentance, which does not send the penitent to Christ. But that which sends the penitent to the death of Christ for the expiation of the sins of men, is altogether unknown out of the Church, where the Gospel of Christ is not known. Therefore an invitation and calling apt and sufficient for saving repentance is not given to all men. Moreover, neither ought this opinion to be approved, *That God by his universal grace grants to all men individually that they may be saved if they will.* For first, it is foolish to assert, That infants, who are born the children of wrath, and die out of the Church, can be saved if they will; since they have not the use of reason or free-will. By the same rule it might be said, That they could walk, and join themselves to any Christian church, if they would. But I ask, as to adults, what is this, That every individual of them can be saved, if they will? Are they not willing to be saved? Without doubt they are. For to be saved, is nothing else but to be happy, which all men individually desire. But perhaps these words are to be understood, *If they are willing to believe in Christ, they may be saved.* I do not dispute, that all men individually may be saved, who are rightly willing to believe in Christ; but I also assert, that every individual who thus believes cannot be damned. Yet I add, that universal grace is not proved by a power of obtaining salvation, conceived by those who are in a state not yet purified, nor ever to be purified. It is therefore evident, that the condition, If they are willing to believe in Christ, cannot be fulfilled by many, unless God wills to send to them preachers of the Gospel. (Rom. x. 14, 15.) For as no one can see a visible object when it is absent, so when a credible object is absent, no one can exercise the act of believing. There are, therefore, multitudes who cannot be saved, because they cannot believe in Christ. They cannot believe in Christ for obtaining remission of sins, because the act of

believing pre-supposes the object having been proposed to the sinner, in which he may believe, as may be collected from Romans iii. 25, 26.

PART III.

[e]It is through men themselves alone, and the hardness of their hearts, that they are not saved.

It is true, that the corruption and hardness of the human heart is the real and positive cause which drives the wicked from salvation, and thrusts them into perdition. It is moreover certain, that God neither will nor can work in those to whom he deigns to grant the means of grace, a contempt or abuse of these means. For as the sun cannot cause darkness, or cold in the air; so God cannot cause malice and wickedness in the human heart. This, however great it is in repelling the means of grace, is wholly to be imputed to man alone; in no way to God. But it ought to be added, in the last place, that there is no hardness in the human will so obstinate, that God cannot soften it if he will, and which he will not at length soften in all the elect, by that special mercy of which the Apostle speaks, *He hath mercy on whom he will*, &c.

I think, therefore, that the opinion of Cameron was here badly expressed.

*[f]*I know that the opinion of the English Divines given at the Synod of Dort, neither establishes universal grace, nor acknowledges that apt and sufficient means of salvation are granted to all men individually upon whom the Gospel hath not shone.

*[g]*Lastly. I think that no Divine of the Reformed Church of sound judgment, will deny a general intention or appointment concerning the salvation of all men individually by the death of Christ, on this condition—If

they should believe. For this intention or appointment of God is general, and is plainly revealed in the Holy Scriptures, although the absolute and not to be frustrated intention of God, concerning the gift of faith and eternal life to some persons, is special, and is limited to the elect alone.

So I have maintained, and do maintain.

JOANN. SARISBURIENSIS.

FINIS.

GENERAL INDEX

OF

SUBJECTS IN THE EXPOSITION.

Abel, Christ the head of, I. 212.
Abraham's bosom, a celestial place and happiness, 471.
Abstinence, see Fastings, see Meats.
Abstinence of Paula, 541; should be moderated, 543.
Acceptance of persons, none with God, II. 90, 211; should not be among men, 212.
Admonishing, what it signifies, and the duty of, I. 318.
Adoption, what, II. 207.
Adverbs, peculiar effect of, 246.
Adultery, how it differs from fornication and rape, II. 38.
Affections and desires, naturally rebellious, I. 252, 452; what it is to set them on things above, II. 7.
Afflictions, to be endured by Christians with a cheerful mind, I. 270; ours are the afflictions of Christ, 271; honourable to suffer them for Christ, 274; the greatest consolation, ibid. Our afflictions are not satisfactory for others, but tend to edification, 275; on what accounts afflictions are borne by saints, 290; future glory a consolation against the afflictions of the godly, II. 29.
Afflictions of Paul, I. 328, 329.
the afflicted ought to be remembered on four accounts, II. 307.
Almsdeeds, to be exercised, 104.
Altars, should be erected to God alone, I. 507; are erected by Papists to angels and saints, ibid.
Ambrose, a passage of his vindicated from falsifiers, II. 298.
Amen, whence derived, and what it signifies, 308.
Angels, when created, I. 197; how sons of God, ibid.; could not create the world, 191; their orders and distinctions, according to the Schoolmen, 194, 195; these orders are not curiously to be enquired into, 196; in what sense reconciled to God by Christ, 244—246; could not reconcile us to God, 239.
are reconciled to us by Christ, 244; the ministry of, in keeping the elect and promoting their salvation, 431; are not to be adored, 428; are not mediators, 429; do not impart grace, ibid.; are not to be invoked as intercessors, ibid.; are not as mediators for Christ, 429; how they may be worshipped, 502; ought not to be worshipped religiously, or with the worship of doulia or latria, 504—506; are worshipped by Papists with the latter worship, 504, 505; the worship of them the doctrine of the Platonists, 498; worshippers of them do not acknowledge Christ for the head of the Church, 511; vows are not to be paid to them, 506; doubtful whether they hear prayers, 427; are but our fellow-servants, 428.
Anger, what it is, and how it differs from wrath, II. 65; why it is to be avoided, 66, 67; what is law-

ful, and what evil, 68; in what sense attributed to God, 54; is in God twofold, paternal and hostile, 58; follows sinners, 55.
Apologues, are neither lies materially, nor formally, II. 79.
Apostles, etymology of the term, I. 3; appointed by the whole Trinity, 5; are God's ambassadors to mankind, 6; which of them preached the Gospel to particular nations, 91; sent generally to the whole world, but some destined for certain provinces for the advantage of the Church, 297.
Apostleship, three things required in it, 3, 4; Paul truly partook of it, 2, 3; the Pope of Rome not so, and hath not apostolic authority, 9—19.
Appearing of Christ threefold, II. 25; his appearing for judgment will be soon, and sudden, 28.
Archippus, who, II. 304.
Aristarchus, who, and how the companion of Paul's captivity, 280.
Assurance, of believers, concerning grace and the remission of sins, I. 37—41; of final salvation, 79, 80, 151; II. 29; full assurance, what, and whence obtained, I. 354.
Attributes, the Divine, not communicated to the human nature, I. 364.
Avarice, what it is, II. 50; the greatness of the sin of, 51, 53.

B.

Baptism, the rite of, what it signifies, I. 441; is efficacious through faith, 22, 445; faith required prior to its administration in adults, afterwards in infants, 448; infants are to be baptized, 449; how we are buried thereby, 441; in baptism we rise again sacramentally and really, II. 10; its mystery should be duly held and ever retained in the memory, I. 437; II. 19.
Baptized persons called saints, and wherefore, I. 20; II. 99; were formerly arrayed in white robes, I. 21; spiritual graces infused into them, ibid.; they are especially consecrated to God, 22; II. 99.
Barnabas, who he was, II. 282.
Beguile, what it signifies, I. 368; 496.
Believer, is sure that he hath faith, I. 37; and that by the certainty of faith, 43; is sure of grace and the remission of his sins, 37; some of the Papists confess this, 52; does not doubt as a believer, 49; a true one is like to a man awake, an apparent one to a dreamer, 48; how he may fall from grace and how not, II. 57; has always an habitual intention of pleasing God, I. 226; and therefore his person is acceptable to God notwithstanding his failures, ibid.; ought to be fruitful, 127.
Blasphemy, whence the word is derived, and what it signifies, II. 69; God blasphemed in a threefold manner; men in a twofold way, ibid.; the great evil of either, 70, 71.
Blessedness, future, in what it consists, II. 25, 26; is solid happiness to be possessed by every servant of God, I. 151; is always to be contemplated and sought after, II. 6; its contemplation a comfort under all trials, 23, 29; wherein it resembles a reward, and wherein not, 206.
Body, taken for the mass of sins, I. 438; our body an object of love, and wherefore, 73; what care is to be taken of it, and what not, 544.
Body of Christ was real, not imaginary, 257; in which he himself truly suffered, and not Simon the Cyrenian, ibid.
Bodies, every one hath in himself three; a natural body, the body of the old Adam, and the body of the new, II. 35; of these the body of sin is peculiarly our's, ibid.
Bodily is put for personally, because the body is taken for the whole person, I. 415.
Brethren, all Christians are, on four accounts, I. 26; and that in Christ, 27; false ones most pernicious, II. 275.
Brothels, not to be suffered in a Christian State, II. 44; condemned by the Fathers, 45; evils of the toleration of them, 46; yet upheld by the Papacy, ibid. and Note.

C

Carthusian Monkery, not a state of perfection, I. 326.
Ceremonies, may be instituted by the Church, and with what cautions, I. 401, 402; 522; are not to be multiplied, 402; 467; 529; whether the observance or the neglect is in itself of any or no consequence, II. 91; Ceremonies of the Jews, I. 478, 472. Christian liberty in regard to all, 480; the legal ones were acknowledgments of human guilt, 461; shadowed forth the grace of Christ, 489; and the very substance in Christ, 492; abrogated by Christ, and why, 404; in what manner, 465, 466; for what time, and how far they might be observed after the passion of Christ, 405.
Charity, what it is, II. 118; pre-eminent among the graces, ibid.; how it fulfils the law, 121; participates with others in all things, I. 57; 372; how it differs from a vicious affection, II. 119; is like a garment, 120.
Charity, among neighbours, especially in loving the saints, I. 74, though unknown, 102; II. 297; towards strangers and enemies, I. 109: devils and the lost not objects of it, 77; the rule of in judging, viz. *presuming any thing to be good till the contrary appears*, I. 22; the rule in acting, viz. *what ye would not should be done to you, do not you to another*, how to be understood, II. 43.
Chastisement of the body by acts of mortification, examples of it, I. 539; errors of those who sin in this respect, 541; how far these exercises may and ought to be employed, 542, 543.
Chastisements, not inflicted upon the faithful by God as satisfactions for sin, 288.
Children, what ought to be the obedience of to parents, II. 169—172; such obedience yields to piety towards God, 179—183; are not to be brought up effeminately, nor treated harshly, 190—192; are as parts of their parents, 193, 194; evils of severity towards them, 194, 195.
Christ, that he might be the Mediator, ought to be God-man, I. 163, 164; it behoved him to be God that he might teach salvation, 409, 410; and that he might be the author of salvation, 410, 411; in what manner he is one person, 415—420; yet not every where as man, 421; II. 13; is the Lord of all things, even as man, I. 35; the cause of the creatures, 187; the Creator of the world, 188; the end of all things, 203; the first-born of every creature, and in what sense, 184, 185; the first-born from the dead, and in what sense, 222—223; he first rose, 223; the author of our resurrection, 224, 225; hath a fulness of grace, 229; and why, 231; he alone hath it, 231; is the channel of grace by the efficacy of operation, the benefit of intercession, and the merit of his passion, 35; he infuses grace, as man, instrumentally, 212; 'all grace is from him, 514; he is the way to God; he alone could and ought to reconcile us, 239; how he hath redeemed us, 166, 167; how he is the Mediator of angels, 244—246; how he is the head of angels, 427.
Christ, the sympathy of in our afflictions, 272; our support in trials, II. 15; what knowledge was in Christ, I. 362; He alone is the head of the Church, I. 17, 18; 126; and that as to both natures, 210, 211; even of the antient church, 211, 212; in what respects he is called the head of the Church, 212, 513—516; of what Church he is the head, 218.
is the only meritorious intercessor, II. 238, 239.
Christ is the object of faith, I. 62; the principal and special object, ibid.; and the adequate object of faith, because he justifies, 61—63; he dwells in us by faith, 316.
Christ, is the image of the Father as God, both as God and as man, 173; the exemplar or model of the creatures, 188.
is as a tabernacle, 410—412; the conqueror of the devil on the cross, 473—475.
how he sits at the right hand of God, as God, II. 12, 14; and as man, 12, 13.

Christ must be served faithfully, I. 36; II. 148.
his appearing and manifestation threefold, II. 25; coming to judgment will be soon and sudden, 28; our life, and how, See Life.
Christ, put for the Church of Christ, I. 272.
Christian, as to the name is nothing, I. 23, 443, 445; serving any other than God is guilty of sacrilege, 23; living in sin is a walking monster, 443.
Christian, the true, ought always to advance, 116, 380, 381; II. 9, 86; is like a fruitful tree, I. 127; in what respects, 129.
is dead to sin, the world, and the flesh, II. 16; in what manner, ibid.; he grows in faith daily, and how, I. 350, 351; does all things in the name of Christ, II. 146.
is in Christ through faith and the Spirit, I. 316; ought to imitate Christ. II. 10, 115.
Christian, his enemies, I. 133; 469.
his life ought not to be a scandal to the Gospel, II. 251; his conversation is in heaven, II. 6, 7.
Christians, ought to teach, and admonish, and restrain one another, II. 138, 139; are called *saints in Christ*, and why, I. 20, 22; *faithful* in Christ, 24; *brethren in Christ*, and why, 26.
are brethren among themselves, ibid.; II. 270, 297, 348; therefore live in concord, I. 26; and united, 348, 349.
Church, whence it is called, I. 217; of what Church Christ is the head, 218; hypocrites are not members of the Church, 219—221, 515; the Church is as the family of God, 294, 295; receives all things from Christ, 514; increase of the Church, what, 516; how the whole is united to Christ, and the members of it with one another, 513—515.
Church hath the power of ordaining external rites, I. 401.
may consist of manifold divisions, 218; each particular one may fall, 12, 20; II. 293.
a domestic family may be a Church, II. 299.
Circumcision, internal what it is, I. 448; the Christian excels the Jewish in three things, 434; its author, and the instrument of it, 438; ought to be total, 439.
Jewish what it signified, 460; chief among their ceremonies, 433.
Circumcision, put for the Jews themselves, I. 451.
Citizenship, a bond of love, II. 288.
Colosse, where situated, see Preface, lxxi; overturned by an earthquake, II. 293.
Comfort, what it comprises, I. 345, 346.
Commendation, conduces to perseverance, I. 374.
Commodus, base deeds of that Emperor, II. 95.
Communication, or impartation, proper, I. 364; 414—417.
not to be had with the ungodly or superstitious, II. 252.
of benefits should be mutual, 301.
Communion of saints, in what it consists, I. 289.
Compassion, what, II. 104.
Conclusion concerning faith, where there is only one proposition of the Scriptures, I. 47.
Concord, see Peace.
the concord of love arises from agreement in faith, I. 348.
Concupiscence, its first motions are sins, II. 48.
threefold: natural, carnal, and spiritual, 49.
Conservation of all things wholly from God, I. 203.
Consolation, spiritual, does not exist without love, I. 342; Papists confess the same when they appeal to their consciences, 347.
all strengthened by the gratuitous promises, 346.
Conversation of a Christian ought to be on heavenly things, II. 5—7.
Corruption natural, in the understanding, will, and affections, I. 452; compared to a state of darkness, 156.
Covetousness, a vice partly spiritual and partly carnal, II. 51.
how a covetous man is said to be an idolater, ibid.
the greatness of the sin, 52.
Creation and preservation alike the act of God, I. 204.

Creatures, cannot create, not even as instruments, I. 191.
our right to them, civil and evangelical, II. 147,
Cross, the punishment of, best suited for our redemption, I. 242.
upon it Christ triumphed, 474; the devil was affixed, ibid.
Custom, changes nature, II, 41, 42.
does not prevail against right, I. 15; nor against the truth of a doctrine, 379, 380.

D.

Darkness signifies the state of corrupt nature, I. 156, 157; how we are delivered therefrom, 158.
Days, no difference of, to Christians, 480; what was heretofore the case among the Jews, 478; how the Jewish holy-days were to be observed for ever, 482; what each prefigured, 231.
holy-days to be observed by Christians, and how, 485.
cautions in the observance of them, 487.
Deacon, *Διακονος*, taken largely and strictly, 103, 293; II. 304.
Death, not to be feared by Christians, I. 226.
of Christ, hath delivered us in two ways, 167; was in a measure not absolutely necessary in itself, but more suited to reconcile us, and why, 241, 242; applicable to all, but not applied to all, 255, 256; to be exhibited in our life, 445.
Demas, why he went back, II. 296.
Desire after temporal riches may be threefold, 49.
of spiritual treasures should be paramount, I. 312.
Detraction, II. 69—71; worse than theft, I. 102.
Devil rages mostly against the Christian, 374.
how Christ hath delivered us from him, 166, 474.
Devils, why called principalities and powers, 469.
how Christ triumphed over them upon the cross, 474.
how being conquered they yet harass us, 475.
Dignities, ecclesiastical to be defended, I. 8; 295; 375.
Dignity twofold, viz. of equality and suitability, 128.
Discourse of Christians, what it ought to be, II. 144; 260.
Doctrines not to be received without examination, I. 308; 534.
general, should be specially applied, I. 248.
and commandments of men, not to be received, 518.
Doubt concerning the remission of sins may exist in believers, but not as believers, I. 50.
Duelling, unlawfulness of, II. 116, 117.

E.

Earthly things, what are so called, II. 8; are perishing, 9; are vain, ibid.; are contrary to heavenly things and opposed to our true happiness, ibid.; are not to be sought after, 8, 9; and that on two accounts, 9.
Education of children, ought neither to be too severe, nor too lenient, II. 190, 191.
Effeminacy what, II. 47; to be mortified and banished, 48.
Effectual calling of the elect, I. 146, 147.
Elect, they alone truly believe, I. 146; 307,
Election, temporal and eternal, II. 98; of which it is that the consideration influences to holiness, 99.
Eloquence of the Scriptures, I. 336.
not to be affected by ministers, 105.
of heretics deceitful and ensnaring, 368, 370.
End the, determines the moral action, I. 125; 201.
how God acts from love to a final one, 199.
of all things is Christ, ibid.
Enemies, we are such to God by nature, 250, 251.
who are those of a Christian, 134; 470; Christ overcame them, 474; who are the enemies of the cross of Christ, 476.
Enemies, our's, are to be loved, I. 74; we must forgive them, and do them good, 75, 76.
Envy makes another's good our own punishment, 58.
Epaphras, his commendations, 102—106.

Equivocation, II. 75, 79, and Note, 83.
Errors spring from ignorance of Christ, I. 143.
Essence of being attributed to things, although they have not the essence of existence, 490.
Eternity of the world disproved, 1. 190.
has a twofold meaning, 484.
Evil-speaking, what, II. 69; heinousness of the sin, 70, 71.
those given to it not to be listened to, 72.
consolations of the godly under it, 72, 73.
Example of sympathy in Mezentius, I. 273; of insensibility in Licinius, 8; of abstinence in Paula, 540; of the Monks of Palestine, 539; of the austerity of the Flagellantes, 540; of the martyrs tempted to Idolatry, II. 253; of prayer in the Egyptian Monks, II. 225; in Old Testament saints, 226; of watchfulness, 233.
for Christians is the life of Christ, II. 114—116.
Exordium of a discourse, its parts, I. 334; regarded by St. Paul, 335.

F.

Faith, twofold; the one unformed, historical, and general; the other formed, justifying, and particular, I. 66;
in what justifying faith differs from that which does not justify, 62, 67—69.
Faith, the object of it in general, whatever is delivered in the Scriptures, 61; specially and principally Jesus Christ under the character of a Mediator, 62; the same faith reposed in Christ before his incarnation and since, 164; 212; 471, 472; 492.
imparted by God alone, I. 85, 86; 307; II. 242, 243; it is the gift of God, I. 447; when infused at once shews the thing believed, and the reason of believing, 353; in what manner the word preached is the instrument of producing faith, 85; is the foundation and the root of religion, 59; what is done without faith is not good, 60.
Faith justifies as to its truth, not as to its degree, 53; it alone justifies, 261; justifying faith is stable, is not lost, 262; the stability of faith twofold; stedfast and firm, 382; both required, 383; stedfast faith what, 376.
Faith does not exclude all doubt, but overcomes it, 51; the full assurance of faith what, and whence it comes, 351; true faith exists not without love, 67, 68; yet is not formed from love, 69; a blind faith is not pleasing to God, 352; is not sufficient for the people, 122.
of the popish Collier, 354, and Note.
Family, the head of, ought to instruct his household in Religion, II. 299.
Fastings, what were in use in the primitive Church, I. 543; examples of fasting, 539; in what manner we should fast, 542—544; how far human laws concerning fasting bind us, 482, 483; a twofold error in the fastings of the Papists, 481.
Father, his being named does not exclude the other persons in the sacred Trinity, I. 55; God is the Father of Christ, as man, 56; the Father of Christ is God, both as God, and as man, ibid.; the Father is not before the Son as God, 186; the Father is specially invisible, 180, 182; is the primary author of our reconciliation, 235; why we are said to be reconciled to the Father, 237, 238.
Father, the very name bespeaks kindness, II. 193.
how the authority of should be exercised, 190—195.
Fathers, under the Old Testament, were saved through Christ, I. 164; 211, 212; 471; they looked to Christ through the ceremonies by faith, 492; were not in Limbus, 470, 471.
Fear of God, the best regulator of actions, II. 200.
Feast of tabernacles, why instituted and what it signified, I. 491.
Festivals of the Jews, how to be observed for ever, 484; the New Moons what they signified, 492; what their other festivals shadowed forth, 490.

Festivals to be observed by Christians, and how, 485, 486.
cautions in the observance of them, 486.
Figurative or parabolic expressions not lies, II. 79.
Flesh, put for original corruption, I. 436.
Forgiveness of injuries, yields advantage to the person forgiving, II. 112.
of sins, how the phrase is to be understood, I. 49; what the act includes, 457; is the property of God alone, 458.
Fornication, what it is, and how it differs from adultery, &c. II. 38.
not regarded as a crime among the heathen, ibid.; yet disapproved of by some of the wiser, 42; the heinousness of the sin demonstrated, 39, 40; not to be tolerated in a Christian State, 45; opposed to charity in many respects, 43; favoured by the Papists, 44; wherefore reckoned among things indifferent by the Apostle, 41.
Fortitude, Christian, in what it consists, I. 132; whence derived, 134; our need of it, ibid.; true, from God alone, 136; how it differs from patience, 137.
Free-will does not fit or dispose us for grace, I. 90; 149; 453. Vide Merits.
Friends, who are such, 250, 251.

G.

Glory future, the twofold array of soul and body, II. 25, 26;
the hope of, a consolation in all adversities, 29.
Glory of Christ, ought to be the end of all our actions, II. 146, 147.
vain-glory to be avoided by Ministers, I. 103.
God, the author and end of all things, I. 199; the preserver of all things, 203—208; acts to a special end, 199; to be loved for himself alone, 70; not to be worshipped through any image, 182.
is the Father of Christ, I. 56. Vide Father.
how he is invisible, 180; unknown, 181; an object of dread out of Christ, 179; omnipresent, II. 201; in a threefold manner, I. 415.
how he is said to be angry, II. 54; is not a respecter of persons, 91; 211; his righteousness in punishing, 56; in how many ways he is blasphemed, 69.
God, his efficiency by his Ministers, I. 8; his philanthropy shewn in appointing them, 9; prevents us, 89; is the fountain of all grace, as he is our Father, 32—34; communicates grace by his Son, 35; the first author of reconciliation, 235; the author of our quickening, 455, 456; the author of salvation by fore-ordaining it, and by effectually calling to it, 145, 146.
God alone ought and could save us, 154.
hated by sinners, and in what manner, 250.
Grace, and peace, the Apostolic salutation, I. 29; why joined, ibid.; why grace is put first, 31; the practice of St. Paul in reference to this, II. 308.
Grace, denotes three things, I. 29; II. 308; all derived from God, I. 301; as our Father, 32, 34; through his Son, in a threefold manner, 351.
efficacious, the property of the elect alone, 146—148; 367; sending it only not found to move the will, 453; necessity of it on account of corrupt nature, 147, 453; fulness of grace, what, 230; our duty to grow in it daily, 116; II. 49.
Gratitude, duty of, I. 128.
See Thanksgiving.

H.

Hand, the right, of God, what it means, and what to sit there, II. 12—14.
Hand-writing of Ordinances, what, I. 461—463; how made void and abrogated, 465, 466.
Hatred, mutual between God and sinners, I. 250; perfect, in what it consists, and how evinced, I. 76, 77.
Head, what required to constitute headship, I. 215, 216; 511—513. of the Church, Vide Christ.
Hearers should have general doctrines applied to them, I. 248; 319, 320.

Help of God in troubles and afflictions, II. 15.
Holiness, what, I. 20, 21; twofold as it respects the end of Redemption, I. 258; threefold as it respects the redeemed, 259, 260; all holiness from Christ, ibid.; our inherent holiness imperfect, but real, 258.
Holiness of life must be joined to true faith, I. 380, 381; without it no one can be happy, II. 27; increases knowledge, I. 131.
Hope, human and divine, I. 51; includes not only the delightful expectation of the will; but the undoubted persuasion of the understanding, 52; rightly inspired hath the same certainty as faith, ibid.; why future blessedness is called our hope, 78, 79.
Hosea, in what sense he took to himself a wife of fornications; II. 42.
Humility, suitable to every condition, II. 106; motives to the cultivation of it, ibid. 107.
Husband, the love of towards his wife, II. 159; the duties of threefold, 160; how a man should choose his wife, 163.
Husbands, should exercise mildness, 164; and avoid every thing opposite thereto, 164—167; an example proposed to them, 161.
Hymns, how they differ from psalms and odes, II. 140.
how they ought to be used by Christians, 141—143.
Hypocrites are not justified, I. 259; are not members of the Church, 515.

I.

Idolatry, or the worship of God by an idol, unlawful, I. 182; the suspicion of severely punished by the antient Church, II. 252, 253; conduct of those allured to it afterwards, ibid.
Idols not to be overthrown by private authority, II. 253.
Ignorance of Christ the cause of errors, I. 143.
Image, what required to constitute its nature, I. 173;
how Christ as God is the image of the Father, 174, 175;
how so as man, 179; why the Spirit is not so called, 176; image of God one thing in Christ, and another in us, II. 87; in what the image of God in man consists, 88.
Images, made by the Papists for worship, I. 182.
Impurity encourages to sin, II. 54.
In (the preposition) often taken for *by* in the Scriptures, I. 138.
Incarnation of Christ should be exhibited in our life, I. 444, 445.
the whole Deity incarnate at the birth of Christ, but not in regard to all the persons, 413; the assumption of the human nature imports the act and the end of it, 414; the whole Trinity concurred in the work of incarnation, but the Son alone was incarnated, 415.
Indulgences, papal, grounded upon four errors, I. 277; their validity refuted, 278—283; not founded in Scripture nor on the Fathers, 284—290; their use explained away by modern Papists, Note 291.
Infants, to be baptized, 448; how they may have faith, ibid.; included in the Covenant of believers, 449.
Infirmity of the Saints, I. 133; in good works, 147; See Good Works imperfect.
Ingratitude, a heinous vice, II. 129.
Injustice and iniquity, the origin of all, 222.
Intercessor, Christ the only meritorious one, II. 238, 239.
Invocation, Christian, differs from Heathen and Jewish, I. 57;
is to be made to God alone, I. 505, 506.

J.

Jesting, not to be affected by Christians, II. 260.
Jesus, Justus, who, and why called by the latter name, 284; the surname given to others, ibid.
Judge, ought not to be an accepter of persons, II. 212.
absolute, no mortal is so in matters of faith, I. 498; 537.
Judging concerning brethren should be according to the rule of Charity, I. 22.

Judgment, twofold, of authority and discretion, I. 538.
day, will come soon and suddenly, II. 28.
Justice of God in punishing, II. 56.
Justification, is accompanied with sanctification, I. 457.

K.

Kind, we ought to be so, II. 105.
Kingdom of heaven, what it signifies, and how many things it denotes, I. 158—161; II. 285.
or celestial blessedness, always to be contemplated and sought after, II. 6, 7. See Blessedness.
Kingdom come, on the Petition "*Let thy*," &c. I. 90, 91.
Knowledge which we have of God threefold, I. 181; neither of which approaches to his essence, ibid.
Knowledge of Christ, 362—364.
Knowledge and virtue ought to be united in a Christian, 131;
is increased by virtue, ibid.
of human learning does not commend us to Christ, 92, 93.

L.

Laity ought to read the Scriptures, I. 122, 266: II. 132, 263;
to teach one another, I. 137, 138.
Laodicea, the celebrated city of, overthrown by an earthquake, II. 293; the Epistle to the Laodiceans, said to be extant, not an Epistle of Paul, but a forgery, 302, 303.
Law, how it differs from the Gospel, I. 262; moral, in what way contrary to us, 463; ceremonial, how contrary to us, 464; how the former is done away, and the latter abrogated by the death of Christ, 465.
Law, works of do not justify, see Works.
Laws, ecclesiastical, do not bind the conscience of themselves, 369; 480; 526; neither do human laws, II. 198.
Lent, the forty days of, badly observed by the Papists, I. 481.
Liberality, should be exercised, II. 105.
Liberty, Christian, in regard to ceremonies, I. 480.
Life of grace and of glory, not bodily or carnal, the true life, II. 20; of grace, the pupillage for glory, ibid.
natural, tends to death; spiritual, to eternal blessedness, ibid.
Life of the saints how hidden, ibid. &c.; how with Christ in God, 21; in what sense Christ is our life, 24; on what accounts he may be called the author of eternal life, ibid.
eternal, in what it consists, 25.
Limbus, of the Fathers, no where exists, I. 471.
Local succession of no avail without succession of doctrine. I. 20.
Long-suffering, what it is, I. 137, how it differs from patience, and from fortitude, 138; use and necessity of it in a Christian, 139, 140.
Love, not God himself, but a gift of God, I. 65.
inseparably follows faith, does not form it, 66, 67; participates with others in all things, 571.
to love, what it is, I. 110, 111; is never abated by separation, 372, 373.
internal, manifested by external acts, II. 169, 282.
Love, two things allure to it and care, I. 107; wherein it is founded, II. 281; is fourfold, I. 70; whence every one derives it, 109.
Love of God towards us, gratuitous, 33; prevents us, 89;
is the first cause of our reconciliation, 235.
of benevolence towards the elect is internal and perpetual, the love of friendship not so, II. 58; 98—100.
Love of a husband towards his wife, in what it consists, II. 159.
of oneself, why not commanded, and wherefore censured, I. 71.
Luke the Evangelist, who and what, II. 295.
Lust, impure, II. 47; the motion of to be repressed, 48.
Lying, what, II. 75; instances of, 79—82.

M.

Magistrates, are all from God, II. 254; to be obeyed even if heathens and idolaters, 198; 254.
Malice, what, II. 66.
Man, naturally dead as to spiritual things, I. 451; prone to every evil, II. 65.
old, what, and how put off, 83; the members of 34, 36.
new, what, 84; his members, 98.
Men all, comprehended under *every creature*, I. 264.
Mark, who, II. 281, 282; converted by Peter, ibid.; wrote the Gospel taught him by Peter, ibid.; first Bishop of Alexandria, ibid.
Marriage, evil of unequal or improper, I. 159; contracted against the will of parents, is sin, 187; confirmed from the moment of contract, 188.
Martyrs, their sufferings make no satisfaction for others, I. 277, 279; festivals of, appointed for the worship of God alone, 487.
Mary, how said to have been full of grace, 232.
Masters, responsibility of, I. 211; II. 221; duties and obligations in regard to their servants, II. 216—220.
Meats, no distinction of to Christians, I. 480, 481; 521—523; what there was formerly among the Jews, 478; what was signified by those forbidden, 490.
Mediator, ought to be God-man, I. 163; the alone Mediator, as well of Redemption as of meritorious intercession is Christ, ibid.
Meekness, the duties of and motives to, II. 107, 108.
Members of the old man, what, II. 34, 35.
Mercy to be shewn on the calamities of others, 103.
Merits of no man extend beyond his own person, I. 280;
none of congruity before grace, 90; 149; 259; nor of condignity after grace, 124; 149; 279.
Might, spiritual, in what exercised and what it effects, I. 132—134.
Mind, See Understanding.
Ministers ought to await a call, I. 29; their call twofold, ibid.; yea, threefold, 268; order ought to exist among them as among unequals, 296; to be attached to certain places and people, 298; when absent from their flock, more solicitous about it, 344; ought never to be wholly absent, 373.
all their sufficiency from Christ and his Spirit, 330; II. 239—241; their efficacy for the salvation of mankind, I. 8; are not to be slothful, 7, 8; 298; 341; are as centinels, 389; what considerations excite them to diligence, 104, 105; II. 305; in what their fidelity consists, I. 105; II. 248; in what their duty in preaching consists, I. 318; ought to teach both the Law and the Gospel, but in different ways, 319, 320; in the discharge of their duty must act impartially towards all, 321; to defend the Gospel and their fellow-ministers, 340; should reprove the vices of all, II. 247; not accommodate their statements to the errors of their hearers, ibid.; ought not to affect eloquence, I. 105; should apply general doctrines, 248; preach the word freely and boldly, II. 246; constantly and diligently, 247; sincerely and faithfully, adding nothing to it, nor withholding any thing, 248, 249; fitly and suitably to their hearers, 250.
Ministers, their dignity, I. 104; 293; II. 271; 288; ought not to decry or depreciate one another, I. 101; II. 272; should endeavour to maintain a good repute, I. 101, 102; ought to be humble, 103; must not be immodest or vulgar, II. 74; are not lords of our faith, I. 268; but *ministers* only, 293; should not only preach to, but also pray for their people, I. 31; 113; 289; constantly and earnestly, 113, 114; II. 290; ought to enquire into the life and manners of every one committed to their care, II. 268; particularly to esteem the more pious, 275.
Ministers, what things afford them joy, I. 373; should especially rejoice in the spiritual welfare of their flock, I. 54; 340; should warn their people against seducers, 389.
how they absolve from sins, I. 286; ought to be animated to en-

dure the cross, I. 270; 292; 329; II. 245; and to exhort others to constancy under it, II. 269.
on what accounts they may declare their labours, I. 338, 339; should be prayed for by the people, I. 238; that they may be useful, 242; competent and diligent, II. 244.
Ministers' doctrines not to be received without examination, I. 388; 538.
Mode of acting sometimes of more importance than the action, II. 246.
Monachism is not a state of perfection, I. 326; II. 92.
Monasteries, ought not to be entered by children against the consent of their parents, II. 174—186.
Monks, the Carthusian, abstain from meat, I. 481.
of Palestine, their austerities, 539.
Mortification what, and what things required to it, II. 31, 33; Christ the author of a threefold mortification, I. 444; quickening joined to mortification, 442, 445; ought to extend to all sins, 439, 457; admits of degrees, 442; in this respect differs from natural death, II. 33; how they who are dead unto sin ought still to mortify themselves, 34; how far the renewed are dead unto sin, 16; how any one can abolish sin in this life, and how not, I. 440; the mortification of a Christian perpetual, laborious, and hazardous, II. 37.
Mortification of the flesh by external exercises; with examples of it, I. 539, 540; how far such exercises may and ought to be undergone, 542, 543; errors of those who sin in this respect, 541.
Multitude tends to confirm the minds of believers, I. 94, 95.
not a mark of the Church, 516, 517.
Mystery, what it signifies, I. 300; taken for the sum of Evangelical doctrine, 356; for the calling of the Gentiles, 300, 502.
Mysteries to be believed, not discussed, 303, 304.

N.

Name of Christ, what it is to do any thing in the, II. 146.
Name, the origin not so much to be regarded as the use, I. 3; without the reality avails nothing, I. 10, 23; 100; 443; II. 274.
Nations, no distinction of with God, II. 90.
Nature, our's good at the creation, I. 250; corrupt, incapable of spiritual things, 146; is not disposed for grace, 453; II. 60; is alienated from God, I. 249; at enmity with God, and God an enemy to it, 250, 251.
Natural corruption, pervades all the faculties of the soul, 452, 453: man thereby dead as to spiritual perceptions, 450; explained by parts, 451, 452; all prone to every evil on account of it, II. 65.
Negations in comparisons, their peculiar use, II. 203.
Neighbour, who is our's, and how the object of our love, I. 72.
New-Moon, the festival of among the Jews, what it signified, I. 492.
Newness of life, 444, 445.
Nobility commends no one to God, II. 94, 95.
Nourishment of the body of Christ, what it signifies, I. 513, 514.

O.

Obedience, see Subjection.
blind, not good, I. 122; 534, 535.
Obedience of wives towards their husbands, II. 151; of children towards their parents, 168; of servants towards their masters, 196.
Obscenity in language to be avoided, 73.
Omniscience, does not appertain to the human nature of Christ, I. 363—365.
Onesimus, a deacon, II. 273.
Opportunity to be embraced, I. 305; II. 257, 258.
Order, what it is, 295, 296; various significations of, I. 374,375; encomiums of it, 375; all things done of God by order, II. 56.
ought to exist among the Minis-

ters of the Church, I. 296; 375, 376.
Ornaments, what are a woman's best, II. 157.

P.

Pappula, instanced by Papists to justify opposition to parental authority, II. 183.
Parents, duty of obedience to them, 169; the extent of it, 171; is well-pleasing to God, 173; restricts children from entering monasteries against their parents' consent, 175—177.
obedience to them must yield to obedience to God, 178, 179.
Parents, conduct of towards their children, 190—193; the evils of treating children harshly, 194.
Passion of Christ was perfect, 273, 274; was satisfactory as well for all punishment as guilt, 278.
Passover, why instituted, and what it signifies, I. 491.
Patience, what, I. 137; how it may be determined as genuine, 140; differs from fortitude, 137; how from long-suffering, ibid.; II. 108.
manifold need of it, I. 138; manifold advantages, 140; motives to it, II. 108; especially necessary to ministers, I. 331, 332.
Patience of Christ, II. 115.
Paul, whence so named, different opinions about, I. 2; his character, life, and commendations from several authors, 2, 3; had all things requisite for the Apostleship, 4; was the Apostle of the Gentiles, 296, 297; why he so often speaks of his Apostleship, 4; his labours, 327, 328; conflicts, 338; why he associates Timothy with himself, 6.
Paula, her abstinence, I. 540.
Peace, meaning of the term among the Hebrews, and as used by the Apostles, I. 30; all from God, 31; II. 123, 127.
among brethren should be sincere, 125; motives to it, 124—126.
Peace and grace, why joined together, I. 29; peace the effect of grace, ibid.
Pædobaptism, I. 448, 449.
Pelagianism, history of, II. 183.
Penitence, our's the work of God, II. 62.
external exercises of, see Mortification.
Pentecost, why instituted, and what it signified, I. 491.
People ought to pray for their ministers, see Ministers.
Perfection or fulness of grace what, I. 230; how manifold, 232; imparted for the way, and for the inheritance, 115; 325; II. 290—292; of parts and degrees, I. 325, 326; absolute not to be attained in this life, I. 147; II. 291; does not arise from good works, I. 149; is not attached to a state of Monachism, 326; II. 187, 188.
Perseverance in grace, to be constantly aimed at, I. 81, 116; 380, 381; II. 291.
Perseverance crowns all, I. 80; II. 291.
Person, what, I. 417; of Christ one, 414 et seqq.; in what sense he is said to be united to the Father, ibid.
the naming of either in the sacred Trinity does not exclude the rest, 55, 209.
Philosophy, true what, 390; is necessary to a Divine, 391; its use in theology manifold, 395—398; and even to commend it, 399; is not contrary, but inferior, to Religion, 393; its abuses manifold, 394; not to be consulted in matters of faith, 391; 509; false the parent of all heresies, 305; 395.
Poor to be relieved, II. 103, 104.
Prayer the parts of, I. 114; how they differ, ibid.; manner of, 113; II. 228; 290; conditions, 224, 226, 227; how we must pray always, I. 58, 113; II. 227; why, 230; must be with watchfulness, bodily and mental, 231—235; with thanksgiving, I. 57, 58; II. 235; why, ibid., 236.
Prayer, should be mutual, 238; ministers should pray for their people, I. 31; 58; II. 280; the people for their ministers, II. 237.
Prayer for others the best mark of love, especially in ministers, I. 340, 341; II. 289.
the weapon of the priest, II. 290.
must be made in a known tongue, and with the understanding, 228, 229; mode of among the Egyp-

tian monks, 225; should be offered to God alone, and why, I. 505—507; he alone is to be entreated for grace, 33.
Prayer, who they are that can confidently pray to God, 36; success of in the Scriptures. II. 226.
Preaching the word, how it is the instrument of producing faith, I. 86; the Gospel was preached through the whole world, and how, 91—93; how ministers ought to preach, II. 246—250.
Presence of God, threefold, I. 415.
Present in Spirit, what, 372.
Pride, to be discarded, II. 156.
Procrastination not to be yielded to, I. 99.
Properties of the Divine Nature not communicated to the human, I. 364, 365.
Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, how they differ, II. 140.
in what manner to be used by Christians, 141—144; antiquity of the custom, 143.

Q.

Quickening of sinners the work of omnipotence, and twofold, I. 455, 456.

R.

Reason natural, discovers not the objects of faith, I. 391; See Philosophy.
Reconcile, meaning of the term, 234, 245; how angels may be said to be reconciled to God, 244, 246; 430; how all creatures, 247.
Reconciliation twofold, 254, 255; the primary author of our's, God; the proximate agent, Christ, 234. is made to the whole Trinity, but said to be to the Father on two accounts, 237, 238; Christ alone could effect it, 239; hath reconciled us to himself, ibid.
its accomplishment through death the most suitable and consistent mode, 241, 242, and by the death on the Cross, 243.
Redeemer, our's ought to be God and man, I. 163; 409, 410.
Redemption four modes of effecting it, I. 166; all redeemed *by* Christ, the elect alone *in* Christ, 163, 164.
Redemption, obtained by Christ alone, 171; our's in this life not complete, and why, 165; not to be contemplated without gratitude, 144; what the redeemed were, and what they become, 154, 155.
Redeeming the time, what it imports, II. 257, 258.
Regeneration, necessarily precedes the resurrection, I. 222.
precedes glory, II. 27.
Religion what it is, I. 503.
does not subvert political order, II. 198.
Remission of sins, what, I. 457; gratuitous, ibid.; universal, 458; how the article in the Creed is to be understood, 48, 49; guilt being remitted the punishment is remitted, 278, 288; 457; to remit sins peculiar to God, 458, 459; how assigned to ministers, 286; 459; assured to believers, 37; may be doubted of by them, but not as believers, 49.
Renewed, their sins hateful to God, but not themselves, 126, 127.
Reputation to be guarded and preserved, I. 102.
Resurrection, Christ the first fruits of it, 224; the threefold author of our's, 225, 226; the Father raised Christ, and yet he raised himself, 448.
Resurrection spiritual as well as bodily, 224, 225; Christ arose from the dead and quickens us from sin by the same Almighty power, 446, 447; II. 10.
of Christ to be exhibited in our life, 445; II. 7.
our's is twofold, and both effected by Christ, II. 10; our spiritual resurrection ought to be a copy of Christ's bodily resurrection, 11; is wrought in us by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, 10.
the confidence of Christians, 29.
Revenge, how far it is lawful and disallowed to a Christian, II. 113, 14.
by duel is not lawful, 116, 117.
Revilers of the Ministry warned, I. 104.
Righteous we are so by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, I. 424.
Righteousness of God in punishing, II. 55, 56.

S.

Sabbath, why instituted and what it signifies, I. 491, 492.
Sacraments without Christ are of no avail, 436, 437; are tenders of grace, but only to Believers, 24; 447, 448; in themselves there is no grace, nor in the *opus operatum*, 436, 446; nevertheless the external signs not to be despised, 437.
Saints, their infirmities illustrated by various similitudes, 133; derive help from God, 134; their works are not perfectly good, 145—149; perform no works of supererogation, 279; are not to be worshipped, 487.
Saints, what constitutes their true life, see Life.
Salt of speech what, II. 261.
Salutation what it is, and its forms, II. 277; how necessary, 278; in what sense forbidden, 279; of Paul, 306; of the Hebrews, I. 29; of the Apostles, 30.
Sanctification, what, I. 20, 21; 456; twofold, 258; threefold, 259, 260; all from Christ, see Holiness.
Sanctification accompanies justification, I. 457.
is effected by degrees in this life, II. 102.
Satisfaction for our sins made by Christ alone, I. 287; 459; to that the Papists themselves resort when consulting their consciences, 347; none made by us either in doing or suffering, 457.
Schoolmen, obtrude their vagaries for articles of faith, I. 305; 357, 358.
Scriptures, are believed on their own authority among the faithful, I. 6; are not confirmed by the authority of the Church, 355, 500; are the sole rule of faith, 267; 423; 499—501; II. 246; are perspicuous, I. 306; eloquent, 336; are the word of Christ in a twofold manner, II. 130, 131; their efficacy in changing men's manners, I. 96; are to be read diligently, 266, 353; by the Laity, 122; 266; II. 132; 263; objections to the practice answered, II. 136; how used in the primitive Church, 300; are like a pharmacopœia, in which nothing is insignificant or useless, 265; impiously compared by Hermanus to the fables of Æsop, I. 355.
Scythians thought to have been the worst of barbarians, II. 92.
Seducers beguile men in two ways, I. 368, 369.
Servant of fortune is not a distinction of nature, II. 217, 218.
deceitful and contumacious towards his earthly master, will be punished by the Supreme Lord, 210.
Servants, their condition formerly, 197; four things necessary to a servant, 216; ought to obey their masters, 197; should serve heartily, for they serve Christ, 202, 207; whom we must serve faithfully as the Lord of all, I. 35, 36.
Serve, to serve God more easy than to serve man, II. 221.
Service, eye, what, II. 199.
Simon the Cyrenian did not suffer in the place of Christ, I. 257.
Sin, all to be avoided, I. 130, 134; 438; 459; II. 64; whence its first motions spring, and what they are, II. 48, 49; what it is to live in it, II. 19, 20; 60, 62.
is a pleasant poison, I. 454; is contagious, II. 257; provokes God to inflict punishment, II. 54—56; its enormity manifested by the magnitude of the ransom, I. 163; 456; the body of sin, what, 438; members of it what, II. 34, 35; how it is dead in the renewed, II. 10.
Sin, original is not the mere privation or destitution of original righteousness, I. 452, 453; II. 37; how it infects the whole man, ibid.
Sins are the chains of the devil, I. 474; different kinds of, II. 49, 51.
Sinners are alienated from and enemies to God, I. 249, 250; are dead, 450; are homicides, 454.
Singing an antient custom, useful, and how to be employed, II. 143. See Hymns.
Slanderers, a lesson for them, I. 102.
Slavery, no ground of distinction as it regards men, with God, II. 94; see Servants.
Soul, put for the whole person, I. 416.
Speech, the salt of, what, II. 261.
Spirit, to be present in, what it is, I. 372.

Spirit Holy, is like a treasurer, I. 21.
why not called an image, 176.
Spiritual things should always be contemplated, II. 6, 7; are especially to be preferred and desired, I. 32; especially by ministers, 104; how far they may be known naturally, 393.
Stedfast, what it signifies, and especially with regard to faith, 376.
Stephen, how he was full of grace, 232.
Strangers to be loved and how, I. 74; the evil of cherishing them more than our own kindred, II. 276, 288.
Strengthening, spiritual, how necessary and effective, I. 132—134.
Subjection, what, how useful and obligatory, II. 152.
of a wife towards her husband, in what it consists, 153.
Succession local, of no avail without succession of doctrine, I. 20.
Sufferings of others claim our sympathy, II. 108; 286.
of believers, see Afflictions.
of Christ, satisfactory, &c. see Passion.
of the Cross, the best means adapted for our redemption, I. 242; 474.
Superiors to be obeyed in things indifferent, II. 171.
Superstitious observances, I. 400.

T.

Tabernacles, feast of, why instituted and what it signified, I. 491, 492.
Temples are due to God alone, 507; are dedicated by Papists to the worship of angels and saints, ibid.
Testament Old, is the New under a veil; the New is the Old revealed, I. 493.
Thanksgiving what, I. 54; to whom especially due, 55; reasons for it, II. 235; should be always joined with prayer, I. 58; II. 235; due to God even for the use of the creatures, II. 147.
evils of neglecting it, I. 129; II. 236.
Theology, not opposed to, but above Philosophy, I. 394.
Theologians employ philosophy on many accounts, 395.
Things above, what are so called, II. 6.
on the earth described, 8; why not to be sought after, 9.
Timothy who, and why called a brother by Paul, I. 5, 6.
circumcised by St. Paul, I. 405.
Tongue must be restrained and regulated, II. 260.
Traditions are not necessary, I. 265; 322; 346, 347; how far to be observed in external things, and how far not, 401, 402.
Traditions human, are not parts of Divine worship, 534, 544; have the appearance of wisdom, and how, 530; to be rejected. See Scriptures as the rule of faith.
Trinity, defined, I. 178; the works of ad extrà indivisible, 5, 35, 55; 136, 145, 153; 209; 235—239; 414.
Triumph, description of Christ's over the demons, I. 468;
upon the cross, 474.
Tychicus, first bishop of Chalcedon, II. 266.

U.

Ubiquity does not attach to the human nature of Christ. I. 421; II. 13.
Unbelievers, none of their works are good, I. 60.
Uncircumcision, various significations of, I. 451, 452.
Uncleanness, what meant by it, II. 46.
Understanding, necessity of in order to decide in questions of moment, I. 120, 121.
Understanding, our's naturally dark, I. 252; in matters of faith altogether blind, 304; 452; how enlightened, 120.
Union, personal, in Christ what, I. 415; does not establish the ubiquity of his body, 419, 421.
mystical, is effected by faith and the Spirit, 426; importance of it, II. 23.

V.

Vices are contagious, II. 257; the chains of the devil, I. 474; should be abandoned by the Christian, II. 63; with promptitude, 64; and in toto, 65; and spiritually, 64.

Vigils public, what they were formerly, and on what occasion instituted, II. 231; their abuse, 233; have very properly ceased, 232, and Note.
private, laudable, 232, 233. See Watchfulness.
Virtue, what, II. 101; its likeness to a garment, ibid.; and the reverse, 102.
Virtue and knowledge, mutually promote each other, I. 131; should be united in a Christian, ibid.
Vocation, the Christian, requires holy manners, II. 64, &c.
of Ministers, threefold, I. 270, 271.
Vow, what, I. 506; to be made to God alone, ibid.
Vows made by Papists to angels and saints, ibid.

W.

Walk, what it signifies in Scripture, I. 123; 380; to walk in sin, what, II. 60; differs from living in sin, ibid.; and from falling into sin, 60, 62.
Warn, our duty to warn and admonish one another, and how it may be done, I. 138, 140.
Watchfulness duty of, and motives thereto, II. 234.
examples of, 233.
Will of God, operative and approving, I. 310, 311; difference between his good pleasure and his visible will, 324.
to be known and done, II. 290, 291.
Will of man, naturally depraved, I. 252; 452.
Will-worship, its origin and parts, I. 130; condemned, ibid.
Wife, what to be regarded in choosing one, II. 163.
in what her subjection consists, 152, 153; reasons for yielding it, 155; impediments to it, 156, 157.
duties of towards her household, 154.
Wisdom, what it signifies, I. 118, 120; 530, 531; how it differs from understanding, 119; from knowledge, 360; whence derived, 121; regards both things to be believed and to be done, 361; to be exercised in discourse, II. 262.
its importance to Ministers, I. 106, 120; 296.
Women ought not to be vain, nor studious of ornaments, II. 156, 157; should content themselves at home, 154.
Word of God. See Scriptures.
of the truth of the Gospel, what, I. 86, 87; how the instrument of producing faith and hope, 85.
Words, our's, should be regulated, II. 144, 145, and that religiously, 260.
Works, good, are of God, and to be performed by Christians, I. 127, 129; are not good, except such as are commanded by God, 130, 146; directed by knowledge and dispose to further knowledge, 131.
Works, all our's, as well internal as external, should be subjected to rule, II. 144, 145; be done in the name of Christ, 146; habitually, 148.
Works of the Law, do not justify, I. 99.
of the renewed, although imperfect, acceptable to God, and wherefore, 128; of the unrenewed not so, 60; are evil, 253, 254.
of supererogation do not exist, 278, 279.
of one creature cannot be imputed to another as meritorious, nor as satisfactory for sin, 279, 280.
Worship, what, I. 502; to be given to God alone, 503; prescribed by God himself, 527, 528.
what to be avoided in it, 532.
Worthiness, twofold, I. 123.
Wrath, what it is, II. 66.
of God, what. See Anger.

Y.

Youth, should live in obedience to parents. See Children.

Z.

Zeal, whence the term is derived, II. 293.
to be united with discretion, I. 369.

INDEX OF QUESTIONS

INCIDENTALLY AND BRIEFLY DETERMINED IN THE WORK.

IN THE EXPOSITION OF CHAPTER I.

PAGE.

WHETHER the Pope of Rome hath apostolical dignity and authority ... ... 9—19

Whether the faithful can certainly conclude that they are in favour with God, and that their sins are remitted them through Christ in whom they have believed ... ... 37—53

Whether Christ is the adequate object of faith as it justifies ... 61—64

Whether our love is God himself 65, 66

Whether there can be true faith without love ... ... ibid.

Whether love is so joined to faith as to be a form of it ... 66—69

Whether it is lawful to do good works from respect to a reward 92—84

Whether the Gospel could have been preached through the whole world ... ... 91—94

Whether in every good work it is necessary to maintain an actual intention of pleasing God 125

Whether it is possible for the regenerate man always to retain the habitual intention of pleasing God 126

Whether a believer is always acceptable to God notwithstanding his failures ... ... ibid.

Whether believers under the Old Testament were saved by Christ 164

Whether the angels were created before the foundation of the visible world 197

Whether God preserves all creatures ... ... 203—208

Whether Christ is the Head of the Church in each of his natures 210—213

Whether the sanctified alone are the members of that Church of which Christ is the head ... ... 218—222

Whether guilt being remitted all punishment is not at the same time satisfactorily remitted 278, 288

Whether merits or superabundant sufferings are allowed to the saints 279

Whether the merits of any one of the saints can be imputed to another for remission of punishment ... ... 278—288

Whether the Pope can be thought to dispense the treasure of the Church by his indulgences ... . 278, 282—289

Whether the Scriptures are perspicuous 306

IN THE EXPOSITION OF CHAPTER II.

Whether the human nature of Christ is omniscient ... 361—366

Whether any one may use Philosophy, and how far, in Theology 389—399

Whether and in what manner the legal ceremonies are abrogated by Christ .. .. 403—406

Whether the human nature of Christ subsists in the person of the Word .. .. 416—422

PAGE.
Whether Christ is the Saviour of angels 430
Whether and in what manner the angels promote the welfare of the elect 431, 432
Whether infants are to be baptized 448
Whether original sin is a mere privation of original righteousness ... . 451—454, and Vol. II. 37
Whether the Limbus of the Fathers is to be admitted ... 470, 471
Whether Christian magistrates may ordain laws for abstinence from meats, and how far they are to be observed 482, 483
Whether Christians may observe festivals, and how far ... 485, 488
Whether all religious worship is due to God alone 503
Whether the Papists render latria, the highest kind of worship, to angels and saints .. .. 504—507
Whether among necessary things that alone pertains to the worship of God which is prescribed by him 527, 528
Whether a blind obedience is acceptable to God 537
Whether and in what manner external exercises of mortification are to be practised .. .. 542—545

IN THE EXPOSITION OF CHAPTER III. VOL. II.

Whether, from the sitting of Christ at the right hand of God, the majesty and ubiquity of his body may be inferred .. 11—14
Whether mortification be of itself in the power of man ... 32—34
Whether those dead to sin ought to be exhorted to mortify themselves 33
Whether simple fornication be a mortal sin ... ... 40—43
Whether brothels may be allowed in a Christian State .. 44—46
Whether first motions are sins 49
Whether and in what manner God is angry with the elect when they sin 58
Whether all sin be evil 68
Whether any lie be lawful ... ... 76—78
Whether equivocation be a lie ... ... 79—82
Whether it is lawful for a Christian to revenge any injury done to him 119
Whether it is lawful to repel an injury by a duel ... ... 116—118
Whether charity fulfils the law 121, 122
Whether the Scriptures are to be read in common by the laity 132—138
Whether a Christian is bound in every action whatever expressly to implore the help of Christ 148
Whether it is lawful for a husband to chastize his wife by stripes and blows 167
Whether married children, or those called to the administration of Church or State, are still bound to yield obedience to their parents, and how far 172
Whether children against the consent of their parents may bind themselves by a monastic vow ... ... 174—189

IN THE EXPOSITION OF CHAPTER IV.

Whether prayer in an unknown tongue be proper .. ... 228—230
Whether the Scriptures alone be a rule of faith ... ... 248—249

CONTENTS OF THE DISSERTATION

ON THE EXTENT OF

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

CHAP.		PAGE.
I.	On the Origin of the Controversy	317
II.	On the death of Christ as the universal cause of salvation, applicable to all mankind	340
	Testimonies for the doctrine derived from the Scriptures ..	343
	Arguments founded in the Scriptures	352
III.	Answers to Objections	366
IV.	The second Proposition stated, explained, and confirmed: in what sense Christ is said to have died for all	401
	1. That he died for all sufficiently	402
	2. That through the merit of the death of Christ a new Covenant was entered into between God and the human race	404
	3. On the Divine ordination depending on the aforesaid Covenant	406
V.	The Confirmation of the doctrine, and objections answered	407
VI.	The last Proposition stated and confirmed: That the death of Christ being granted to be applied to all men on condition of faith, it is consistent with the goodness and justice of God to supply or deny, either to nations or to individuals, the means of application, and that according to the good pleasure of his own will	273
VII.	On the death of Christ as it regards the predestinated alone	513
	Testimonies of Scripture considered	517
	Arguments derived from the Scriptures	525
	The testimonies of the Fathers	537
	Schoolmen and Popish writers	542
	Protestant Authorities	547
	Conclusion	556

TRACT ON THE GALLICAN CONTROVERSY.

Appeal of the French Divines on the Controversy in the Reformed Gallican Church		561
Reply of Bishop Davenant		563

INDEX

TO

THE BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

OF

FATHERS, HERESIARCHS, SCHOOLMEN, &c.

APPENDED BY THE TRANSLATOR.

☞ Those names printed in Italics occur only in the Dissertation on the Death of Christ.

	Vol. I.	II.
A.		
Abelard		435
Abbot, Robert (Bishop of Salisbury) ...		453
Albert	148	
Alphonsus de Castro		41
Altissiodorensis, alias William Bp. of Auxerre	68	
Alvarez		435
Ambrose	174	
Ames		224
Andreas, Jacobus ..	364	
Andreas Vegas ...		546
Anselm	290	
Anthropomorphites ..	180	
Apelles	388	
Aquinas	33	
Archytas		212
Aretius		338
Arius	176	
Arminius		366
Arnold		448
Athanasius		409
Athenagoras ...	510	
Augustine	7, 72	45
B.		
Bartoli		83
Basil	185	
Basilides	257	
Bede ...	73, 236	
Bellarmin	9	
Bernard ...	32, 116	
Boethius	200	
Borreus		366
Bower	214	
Budæus	497	
Bullinger		337
Bradwardine ...		477
C.		
Cajetan	12	
Calvin	143	
Cameron		561
Capitula Gallorum ...		321
Catharinus, Ambrose	52	
Cassian	77	
Cecil, Rev. Rd. (quoted)	78	
Chemnitz	365	
Chrysostom ...	3, 111	
Circumcelliones ...	253	
Clemens Alexandrinus ..	60, 327	
Coligny (murder of, Note)	75	
Cologne, proceedings at	53	
Divines of	547	
Councils referred to		
Ancyra		253
Calcedon...	282, 546	
Carthage... ...		185
Eliberis		232
Gangra		183
Leyden		335
Mentz		334

	Vol. I.	II.
COUNCILS continued.		
Nice cited ...	14, 177	
Orange		445
Toledo		185
Trent Vol. II. { Text 248 / Note 132		
Tribur		186
Valence		322
Cusa	16	
Cyprian ...	14, 25, 547	
Cyril	168	
D.		
Damascenus ...	56	
Decretals of Gratian ..		44
Dionysius	194	
Dorotheus		266
Durandus	38	
E.		
Ebionites	410	
Œcumenius ..	154	
Epicureans	139	
Epiphanius ...		92
Erasmus	87	
Estius		510
Eusebius	3	
F.		
Fathers (on the use of)	61, 249	
Faustus	404	325
Flodoard		333
Fulgentius	411	
G.		
Gelasius (quoted) ...	420	
Gerson	90	
Godeschalcus ...		334
Grabbon	326	
Gratian	285	44
Gregory, the Great ...	12	
Gregory of Tours ...		182
Grevinchovius ...		224 / 514
H.		
Hales	221	
Herman, Abp. of Cologne	53	
Hilary	424	
Horsley, Bp. (quoted)		22
Hospinian	540	
Hostiensis (Henry de Susa)	15	
Huber		458
Hugo	195	
I.		
Illyricus Flacius ...	214	
Irenæus	256	
Isidore	20	
J.		
Jerome	3	
Joachim	357	
Johnson, Dr. (quoted)	8	
Justin, Martyr	72, 96, 98	
L.		
Lactantius	96	
Leo, Pope, the Xth.	281	
Leo, the XIIth.		133
Leontius		331
Lombard ...	... 64, 118	
Loyola, Ignatius ...	534	
Lucidus		6
Lyranus, Nicholas de Lyra	198	
M.		
Malderus		531
Manichæus	192	
Marcion	ibid.	
Marlorat		522
Massilians		505
Maximus Tyrius ...	230	
Mazolini	284	
Melancthon ...	193	
Molanus	133	
Monotholites ...	366	
Montanus, Arias ...	94	
Musculus (Wolfgang)	214	
N.		
Nazianzen, Gregory ...	128	
Nicephorus	3	
O.		
Œcumenius... ...	154	
Origen		78

P.	Vol. I.	II.
Paræus		355
Parisiensis (William Bp. of Auverne) ...	21	
Parmenian		238
Parsons		80
Paschasius		540
Paula	541	
Paulinists	413	
Pelagius	158	318 et seq.
Pennie, Mr. J. F.'s Poetry	392	
Peripatetics ...	190	
Philo, Judæus ...		217
Phocylides		212
Picus, Mirandola, Giavonni Pica ..	354	
Piscator		414
Pius VIIth. (Pope) ...		132
Prierias, Sylvester ...	284	
Primasius		319
Prosper	60	
Prudentius	80, 81	
Puccius		459

R.		
Rhemish Annotators...	276	
Rhenanus, Beatus ...		134
Ribera	44	
Rupert	336	

S.		
Sabellius	178	
Samosatenians ...	413	
Scapula	75	
Schoolmen, their Theology	119	
Scotus	46	
Silvester Prierias ...	284	
Soto, Dominic ..	542	
Stapleton		302
Staphilus	354	
Suarez		529

T.		
Tatians	481	
Tertullian (quoted) ...	74	
Tertullian's life ...	171	
Theodoret	169	
Theophylact ...		178
Thomson, Richard ...		448
Tilenus		448
Tremellius	30	

V.		
Valentinians ..	258	
Vasques		546
Vincentius Lirinensis ...		320
Vitalis		505
Vorstius		548

W.		
Whitaker, Dr. William refutes Stapleton		135 302
William, of Auverne, Bp. of Paris ...	21	
William, Bp. of Auxerre	68	

INDEX

OF

SUBJECTS AND WORKS

INCIDENTALLY GLANCED AT

IN THE NOTES.

Arians, persecutors in the 5th Century, I. 200
Arundel's Visit to the Seven Churches, *Introduction*, p. lxxii.
Augustine vindicated from Popish distortions, Vol. II. 45, 49; from the malevolence of others, I. 7; 72.
"Authentic details of the Waldenses," a work not sufficiently known, I. 140.
Autonomasia, meaning of the term, I. 79.

Biddulph's Essays commended, I. 24.
Bible Societies, Pope Pius VIIth's opinion of, II. 132.
Bower's Lives of the Popes, I. 192, 214.
Budd, on Infant Baptism, I. 24.
Burton's Testimony of the Fathers, I. 178; 411, 413.

Cecil, Rev. Richard, quoted on *artifice*, II. 78.
Charity, on Roman Catholic, I. 23; 277.
Christian Missions, a plea for, I. 251.
Christianity the great elevator of woman, II. 167.
Church of Rome, principles and conduct of, I. 75; II. 77, 83; 132, 178.
Missionary proceedings of, I. 11.
Clarke's Succession of Sacred Literature, I. 175, 249.
Cognitio, on the use of the term, I. 38.
Collect for the fifth Sunday after Trinity cited, II. 124,
Coligny, Admiral, evidences of his murder against the Church of Rome, I. 75.
Conybeare's opinion of Augustine's writings, I. 7; of Calvin's, 144.

Duty of studying the *early* history of the Church, II. 321.

Equivocation, opinion of the Jesuits respecting, II. 83.

Faber's Difficulties of Romanism, I. 19.
Fathers, on the use of, I. 61.
on the contradictory representations given of them, I. 175; 249.
Fletcher, Rev. J. on Popery, I. 18.
Fulke's Rhemish Testament commended, I. 276.

Garbett, Rev. J. on Infallibility, I. 19.
Gauntlet, anecdote by him, I. 23.
Gospel, introduced into England before Pope Gregory sent St. Austin, I. 92; 548.
effects of in promoting Christian love, I. 74; in changing the hearts of men, 96, 98.
Gregory the Great, opinions respecting his character, I. 13.
Gregory XIII. conduct of on the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, I. 75.
Grier's Epitome of the General Councils, I. 178.

Hellebore, its use among the antients referred to, II. 77.
Horne's "Critical Study" noticed and recommended, I. 143, 475; II. 218.
Hooker, referred to, I. 208.
Horsley, Bp. his sense of Phil. iii. 21, II. 22.

Idolatry upheld by the Papists, I. 182.
Images and pictures, condemned by the Council of Eliberis, II. 232.
Index Expurgatorius, its jealousy about Apostolic Succession, II. 273.
Indulgences, meaning attached to the term by the antient Scholastics, I. 39.
absurdity of the system of, 291.
Infallibility, works in refutation of, I. 19.
Inform, antient use of the term, II. 126.

Jesuits, their rise, importance, numbers, and intrigues, I. 535—537.
Justification, obscure notions of prior to the time of Luther, I. 7; evidenced, 10, 52, 67, 96, 118.

Kaye's (Bp.) Ecclesiastical History, I. 172, 191; 472.

Lambeth articles, II. 136.
Liberalism of the present age, an error of a former day carried into wider operation, II. 242.

Marsh's Edition of Douglas's Criterion recommended, I. 61; 178.
Mendham's "Literary Policy of the Church of Rome" noticed and recommended, I. 76.
Modern departure from Christianity, I. 28.
Mosheim cited on the character of Melancthon, I. 193; on early schisms, I. 202; 253.

Nicene Creed, history, and defence of, I, 177.

Ordinary, meaning of the term, I. 10.

Papists, withhold the Scriptures, II. 132.
do make images for Divine worship, I. 182.
Peter, disproved to have been Bishop of Rome, II. 285.
Phelan's Catholic doctrine of Tradition, II. 184.
Pope, not the successor of St. Peter, II. 273.
Pope Clement IV. anecdote of, I. 34.
Pope Pius IV. maintained idolatry, I. 183.
Prayer of Thomas Aquinas before study, I. 34.
of St. Chrysostom, in use in the Greek Church, 112.
Protestantism, vindicated, I. 183.

Reformer, what is requisite for one, I. 91.
Reeve's Early Christian Apologists, II. 320.
Rome, its abominations, I. 75; II. 44, 46.

Schisms, opposed, I. 376.
School Divinity, crabbedness of, I. 181.
Scott's Continuation of Milner's Church History, I. 52, 67, 91.
Scriptures, decree of the Council of Trent respecting their use, II. 132; of Pope Leo XII. and Pope Pius VII. ibid.
Slave, Scriptural meaning of the term, II. 205.
Slavery, modern enormity of, II. 94; 219.
Smith's Errors of the Church of Rome, I. 183, 198.
Socinianism, works in refutation of it, I. 117, 238.
Supremacy, Papal, first workings of, I. 13, 186; II. 185; indefensible, I. 214; 547.

Theology of the Schools, I. 219.
Tithes always upheld by the Church of Rome, II. 186.
Townsend's Accusations of History against the Church of Rome, I. 75.
Traditions of the Papists overturned, II. 285.
Transubstantiation, exploded, I. 420.
Troy's (papal Abp.) Rhemish Testament condemned, I. 277.
Turner, Sharon, cited, I. 183; II. 81.

Union of the two natures in Christ, vindicated by Gelasius, I. 420.
Unity of the Church of Rome, II. 322.

Waldenses, vindicated by St. Bernard, I. 116.
conduct of, 140.
Works in refutation of Popery, I. 19.
Worship, as defined by the Romish Church, I. 503.

INDEX

OF

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE

EXPLAINED BY THE WAY.

(The Translator has greatly amplified this Index, conceiving, that as many texts of Scripture, not noted in the Original Index, are yet illustrated by the connexion in which they stand in the work, it would prove useful to give them a place here. Also, in this Index are included a few texts discussed in the Dissertation on the Death of Christ.]

	VOL.	PAGE.
Gen. I. 1, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*	I.	198
I. 27, *So God created man in his own image*	II.	88
II. 2, *God rested from all his works*	I.	205
24, *Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife*	II.	172
III. 15, *It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel*	I. & II.	159 523
IV. 5. *Cain was very wroth and his countenance fell*	II.	66
XXXIX. 10, *He hearkened not unto her to be with her*		48
Exod. XII. 14, *Ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord for ever*	I.	484
XXXI. 16, 17, *It is a perpetual covenant, a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever*	ib.	
Levit. XIX. 17, *Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him*	II.	139
XXIII. 21, *It shall be a statute for ever, &c.*	I.	484
1 Saml. XII. 23, *Be it far from me to sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you* ..	ib.	113
1 Kings XI. 3, *Women turned away his heart* ..	II.	40

	VOL.	PAGE.
2 Kings IV. 29, *If thou meet any man by the way salute him not, and if any salute thee, answer him not again*	II.	279
Job XXI. 3, *Is not destruction to the wicked, and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?*		55
Psal. I. 3, *He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, and that bringeth forth his fruit in due season*	I.	127
VIII. 6, *Thou hast made him to have dominion,* &c.		184,199
XLIV. 6, *In Thy name will we tread under our enemies*	II.	146
XLIX. 8, *No man can deliver his brother, nor give to God a ransom*	I.	280
LXXXVI. 2, *Preserve my soul for I am holy*		27
CXVI. 12, 13, *What shall I render unto the Lord,* &c. .... I. 55,	II.	235
CXIX. 12, *I have inclined my heart to perform thy statutes even unto the end*		83
Prov. XX. 9, *Who can say I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?* ..	I.	41
XXII. 24, *Make no friendship with an angry man*	II.	67
XXVIII. 14, *Happy is the man that feareth always*	I.	45
Eccl. IX. 1, *No man knoweth whether he is worthy of love or hatred, but all things are held doubtful as to the future*		42
Isa. XLII. 6, *I the Lord have called thee, and have given thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles*		228, 235
LIII. 10, *If he shall lay down his soul for sin,* &c.	I. & II.	444, 523
LIX. 2, *Your iniquities have separated between you and your God*	I.	250,451
Jer. IX. 25, *Behold, the days come that I will punish all them that are circumcised with the uncircumcised*		452
XXXIII. 8, *I will cleanse them from all their sins, and pardon all their iniquities*		458
Ezek. XXXIII. 2, *I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live*	II.	432
Lament. V. 2, *Turn thou us, and we shall be turned*	I.	453

	VOL.	PAGE.
Hosea I. 2, *Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms, &c.*	II.	42
Joel II. 12, *Turn unto me with all your heart*	I.	44
II. 14, *Who knows if God will return and repent*	ib.	
Micah V. 2, *His goings forth have been from of old, &c.*		186
Eccles. V. 5, 6, *Concerning propitiation be not without fear to add sin, &c.*		42
Matt. III. 8, *Bring forth fruits worthy of repentance*		124
V. 39, *Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also*	II.	113
XIII. 4, *The righteous shall shine forth as the sun*		26
XV. 17, *Do ye not yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth, goeth into the belly, &c.*	I.	525
XVI. 19, *Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*		286
XXII. 14, *Many are called but few chosen*		218
XXIV. 45, *Who then is that faithful and wise steward, &c.*		106
XXVI. 52, *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword* .. .	II.	118
Luke I. 28, *Mary full of grace*	I.	232
X. 11, *Salute no man by the way*	II.	279
XII. 19, *Thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, &c.*		50
XVIII. 1, *Men ought always to pray and not to faint*	I.	113
21, *The kingdom of God is within you*		160
XXIV. 19, *Tarry ye in Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high* ..		134
John I. 18, *No man hath seen God at any time* ..		180
III. 16, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c.*	II.	343
III. 36, *He that believeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him*	I.	251
V. 39, *Search the Scriptures, they testify of me*		62
XVII. 2, *Thou hast given him power over all flesh, &c.*	II.	517
Acts III. 2, *The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul*	I.	5
IV. 12, *There is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we can be saved*		239, 318

	VOL.	PAGE.
Acts V. 41, *They departed from the presence of the council rejoicing that they were counted worthy, &c.*	I.	141,271
VIII. 22, *Repent therefore, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee*		44
XIII. 38, 39, *Through Christ is preached the forgiveness, &c.* ...	& I.	63 346
XV. 10, *Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the disciples which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear*	I.	402
20, *They should abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, &c.*	II.	41
XVII. 28, *In him we live, and move, and have our being*	I.	205
Rom. I. 10, *That which may be known of God is manifest in them, &c.*		393
V. 8, *God commendeth his love toward us, &c.*		236,242
19, *By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous*	II.	341
20, *The law entered that sin might abound*	I.	385
VI. 12, *Let not sin reign in your mortal body, &c.*	II.	32
VII. 19, *The good that I would I do not, &c.*	I.	126,253
VIII. 24, *We are saved by hope*		51
25, *If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it*		78
37, *In all these things we are more than conquerors*		135
XII. 5, *We being many are one body in Christ, &c.*		515
10, *Be kindly affectioned one towards another, &c.*		26
XV. 2, *Every one of us should please his neighbour*		125
1 Cor. I. 26, *Ye see your calling, brethren, &c.*	II.	93
II. 12, *We have received the Spirit that we may know the things, &c.*	Note, I.	38
14, *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, &c.*		452
IV. 8, *Ye are full, ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us, &c.*		385
V. 3, *Being absent in the body, I am present with you in spirit*		109
XII. 21, *The head cannot say to the feet, Ye have no need of me*		17

	VOL.	PAGE.
1 Cor. XIII. 7, *Charity hopeth all things*	I.	76
12, *We see now through a glass darkly*		181
XV. 20, *Christ is risen—the first fruits*, &c.		226
2 Cor. II. 10, *For what I myself forgive, if I have forgiven any thing, for your sakes forgave I it*, &c.		286
V. 18, 19, *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*, &c.	II.	347
20, *Now then we are ambassadors for Christ*	I.	9
VI. 17, *Come out from among them, and be ye separate*	II.	252
XIII. 5, *Know ye not that Christ is in you*	Note, I.	38
Gal. I. 10, *If I pleased men I should not be the servant of God*		125
II. 7, *The Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto ME*, &c.		297
IV. 8, *Ye did service unto them which are no gods*		504
Ephes. I. 4, 5, *He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world* ..		211 & II. 468, 517
17, *That the Father of glory may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him*	II.	87
II. 2, *Wherein in time past ye walked according to the prince of this world*	I.	156
5, *By grace are ye saved*		29
IV. 1, *I pray that ye walk worthy of the vocation*, &c.		123
7, *To every one of you is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ*		116
29, *That it may minister grace unto the hearers*	II.	142
V. 25, *Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it*		159
Phil. I. 27, *Let your conversation be as it becometh the Gospel of Christ*	I.	123
II. 7, 8, *He humbled himself and became obedient unto death*, &c.	II.	341
12, *Work out your salvation with fear and trembling*	I.	45
III. 18, *Many walk of whom I have told you often and tell you now even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ*		476
21, *Who shall change our vile body*, &c.	II.	22

	VOL.	PAGE.
Phil. IV. 3, *I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me*	I.	330
1 Thess. II. 12, *We charged you that ye would walk worthy of God*		123
IV. 3, 4, *This is the will of God, even your sanctification*		117
V. 12, *We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you*		107, 342
17, *Pray without ceasing*	II.	113 226
2 Thess. III. 6, *Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly*	I.	374
1 Tim. I. 12, 13, *I thank God who hath enabled me, &c.*	II.	62
II. 4, *God will have all men to be saved, &c.*	I.	324
III. 16, *God was manifest in the flesh*		179
IV. 12, *Let no man despise thy youth*		8
Titus II. 11, *The grace of God which bringeth salvation, &c.*		93
14, *He gave himself that he might purify us, &c.*	II.	520
Hebrews I. 3, *Upholding all things by the word of his power*	I.	205, 246
6, *Let all the angels of God worship him*		196, 428
14, *Are they not all ministering spirits, &c.*		431
X. 4, *A body hast thou prepared me*		256
1 Pet. I. 9, *That ye may receive the end of your faith, &c.*		84
18, *Ye were redeemed not with corruptible things*		167
III. 14, *The answer of a good conscience towards God*	II.	224, 443 17, 100
V. 2, 3, *Feed the flock of God which is among you, not as being lords, &c.*	I.	293
1 John IV. 7, *Love is of God*	II.	119
8, *God is love*	I.	65, 66
Rev. XXII. 13, *I am the first and the last*		186

THE END.

ERRATA.

Page 42, § 3, line 4, for 11, read 2.

261, before § 3, read—But says the Apostle, *Let your speech always*, &c.

Pp. 269 and 271, in the head line read—Vers. 7, 8.

Page 325, Note, line 2, for *Levins*, read *Lerins*.

IN VOL. I.

In the Life, page xi. line 12, in some copies, the comma should be after *major ;* and for *honore*, read *ponere.*

Page 123, line 4 of the middle section, the reader will be so good as insert, after *vocation*—1 Thess. II. 12, *Worthy of God ;*—and in the following quotation to read—*worthy of the Gospel.* Also, on

Page 170, dele last line of the Note, and read—to which Garner added a fifth Volume in 1684.

Page 547, for "*those Editions*" twice, read—this Edition.

Date Due			
My 28 '40			
F 15 '45			
Ap 25 '47			
JY 5-'49			
FE 7-'52			
FEB 29'56			
[illegible]			
FACULTY [illegible]			
[illegible]			

BS2715 .D247 v.2
An exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00066 0920